Vol. IX] [Parts 1-4

The Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha



ALLAHABAD

Vol. IX] NOVEMBER, 1951 [Part 1
Vol. IX] FEB.—MAY—AUGUST, 1952 [Parts 2, 3, 4
(*Issued in November, 1953*)

The Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha



ALLAHABAD

Reprinted March, 1975

Published by
Dr. Brahma Mitra Awasthi, Acting Principal,
Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha,
(Formerly Ganganatha Jha Research Institute)
Allahabad

Printed at
Eagle Offset Printers,
15, Thornhill Road,
Allahabad

JOURNAL
OF THE
GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE

NOVEMBER, 1951

CONTENTS

JOURNAL

OF THE

GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE

FEB.—MAY—AUGUST, 1952

CONTENTS

JOURNAL
OF THE
GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Vol. IX] NOVEMBER, 1951 [Part 1

VIDIŚĀ IN ANCIENT INDIA

By B. C. LAW

VIDIŚĀ was a famous city in early times immortalised by Kālidāsa in his *Meghadūta*. The Vaidiśas were the people of Vidiśā[1] also called Vaiśya-nagar which was an old name of Besnagar. According to the *Rāmāyaṇa* (Uttarakāṇḍa, Ch. 121) the city was given to Satrughna by Rāmachandra. The *Garuḍapurāṇa*[2] describes it as a city full of wealth and happiness (*sarvasampatsamanvitaṃ*). It contained various countries (*nānājanapadākīrṇaṃ*), jewels (*nānāratnasamākulaṃ*), big mansions and palaces, prosperous and pompous (*śobhāḍhyaṃ*). It was an abode of many religions (*nānādharmasamanvitaṃ*)

Description and location.

Vidiśā or Vedisa (Skt. Vaidiśa, Vaidaśa) is the old name of Besnagar, a ruined city, situated in the fork of the Bes or the Vedisa river and the Betwa (Vetravatī),[3] in the kingdom of Bhopal, within two miles of Bhilsa. According to the *Purāṇas* Vaidiśa was situated on the banks of the river Vidiśā which took its rise from the Pāripātra mountain.[4] The ancient city of Vidiśā men-

---

[1] *Meghadūta,* I, 24, 25 and 28.

[2] Bombay Ed. published by Sadashib Seth, Ch. 7, śls. 34-35.

[3] *Meghadūta,* Pūrvamegha, 25 śl.

[4] Law, *Geo. of Early Buddhism,* 35.

tioned in the Luders' List (Nos. 254, 273, 500, 521-24, 712, 780, 784, 813, 835 and 885), identified with Bhilsa in the Gwalior State, was situated at a distance of 26 miles north-east of Bhopal. It lay at a distance of fifty *yojanas*[5] from Pāṭaliputra.[6]

According to the Pali Legend of Aśoka the way from Pāṭaliputra to Ujjayinī lay through the town of Vedisa.[7] There is every reason to believe that Vidiśā was included in the kingdom of Avantī.[8] In the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* we have mention of Vidiśā as one of the Aparanta neighbours of Avantī. It is definitely known that the dominions of Puṣyamitra, the founder of the Śuṅga dynasty, extended to the river Narmadā and included Vidiśā, Pāṭaliputra and Ayodhyā.[9] But even if Avantī was included in the Śuṅga empire, Ujjayinī must have yielded place to Vidiśā as the viceregal headquarters.

Capital city.

Vidiśā was the capital of Eastern Malwa.[10] It remained as the western capital of Puṣyamitra and Agnimitra of the Śuṅga dynasty.[11] According to the *Meghadūta* (vs. 25-26) it was the capital of the Daśārṇa country[12] which was one of the sixteen janapadas of Jambudvīpa.[13] From the Vindhyapāda the cloud messenger was to proceed to the country

---

[5] One yojana=about seven miles.

[6] *Mahābodhivaṃsa*, 98-99.

[7] *Samantapāsādikā*, p. 70; *Ujjeniṃ gacchanto Vedisanagaraṃ patvā.*

[8] Law, *Ujjayinī in Ancient India*, Gwalior Archaeological Department publication, p. 4.

[9] Raychaudhuri, *Political History*, 4th Ed., p. 308.

[10] Bhandarkar, *Carmichael Lectures*, 1921, p. 88.

[11] *Cambridge History of India*, I, p. 523.

[12] *Mahābhārata*, Ādiparva, CXIII, 4449; Vanaparva, LXIX, 2707-8; Udyogaparva, CXC-CXCIII; Bhīṣmaparva, IX, 348, 350, 363; Cf. *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa*, 57. 52—55; *Meghadūta*, I, 24, 25 and 28.

[13] *Mahāvastu*, I, 34; *Lalitavistara*, Lefmann Ed., p. 22 : *Sarvasmin Jambudvīpe Ṣoḍaśajānapadeṣu.*

of Daśārṇa in the direction of which lay the well-known capital city of Vidiśā on the Vetravatī. The Daśārṇas who figure in the *Mahābhārata*[14] as one of the tribes who fought with the Pāṇḍavas in the great Kurukṣetra war, occupied the site on the river Daśārṇa which can still be traced in the modern Dhasan river[15] that flows through Bundelkhand rising in Bhopal and emptying into the Betwa river or the Vetravatī.[16] There were two countries by the name of Daśārṇa: western Daśārṇa[17] representing eastern Malwa and the kingdom of Bhopal, and eastern Daśārṇa[18] forming a part of the Chattisgaḍh district in the Central Provinces.[19] The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (57. 21-25) refers to the Daśārṇa river which gave its name to the country through which it flowed.[20] The modern Dhasan (also known as the Dashān river) with which it has been identified near Saugor, flows between the Betwa (Vetravatī) and the Ken, an important tributary of the Yamunā below the Vetravatī known to Arrian as the river Cainas. The same Purāṇa (57. 19-20) mentions Vidiśā and Vetravatī[21] among other rivers issuing

---

14 Karṇaparva, Ch. 22, 3; Bhīṣmaparva, Chs. 95, 41, 143; Droṇaparva, Chs. 25, 35.

15 It is connected with the Rikṣavanta (Ouxenton)—Law, *Geographical Essays*, p. 108.

16 Law, *Tribes in Ancient India*, p. 375.

17 *Mahābhārata*, Ch. 32.

18 *Mahābh.*, Ch. 30.

19 *JASB*, 1905, pp. 7, 14.

20 Cf. *Mahābhārata*, II, 5—10.

21 The water of this river was good for drinking purpose. Its waves rippled in joy indicated by their murmuring noise (*Meghadūta*, II. 26; Cf. *Jāt.* IV, p. 388). This river flows into the Yamunā. It was much used and many tooth-sticks were found in it left by the bathers after ablution (*Jāt.* No. 497). Between this river and Ujjayinī lay the river Nirvindhyā (Law, *Geographical Essays*, p. 114; Thorton's *Gazetteer*, Gwalior and Bhopal; *Meghadūta*, I. 28-29; Cf. *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, IV. 14-15).

from the Pāripātra mountain. The river Vidiśā[22] must be connected with the town Vidiśā on the Vetravatī, which was one of the five hundred rivers flowing from the Himalayas as mentioned in the *Milinda-Pañho*[23] The temple of Bhailaswāmī which was situated on the Vetravatī at Bhilsa in the Gwalior State, 34 miles from Bhopal and 8 miles from Sāñchī, must have given rise to the name of the Bhilsa town.[24] According to Pargiter Vidiśā was one among many small kingdoms into which the Yādavas appear to have been divided.[25] There was a place called Kārpāsigrāma[26] (occurring in three inscribed labels on the railing of the Sāñchī Stūpa I) in the neighbourhood of Vidiśā and certainly within Ākarāvantī noted for cotton and cotton industries.

Vidiśā and Vetravatī rivers.

Neighbouring village.

Since the time of Aśoka it became an important centre of Buddhism and later one of Vaiṣṇavism. It came into prominence for the first time in Buddhism in connection with the viceroyalty of Aśoka. The importance of Vidiśā, the chief city of Daśārṇa, was due to its central position on the lines of communication between the seaports of the western coast and Pāṭaliputra, and between Pratiṣṭhāna and Śrāvastī.[27] Vidiśā (Vedisanagara or Vessanagara) was a halting place on the Dakṣiṇāpatha.

Importance.

Vidiśā was famous for ivory work.[28] One of the sculptures at Sāñchī was the work of the ivory-workers

---

22 *Mārkaṇḍeyap.* LVII. 20.

23 Trenckner Ed., p. 114–*Himavantapabbatā pañcanadisatāni sandanti.*

24 *EI.*, XXIV, pt. V, January, 1938, p. 231.

25 *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition,* p. 273 and fn. 7.

26 Luders' List Nos. 260, 515; Law, *Ujjayinī,* p. 8.

27 *CHI.*, p. 523.

28 *Ibid.*, p. 632.

of Vidiśā.[29] The *Periplus* mentions Dosarene as famous for ivory.[30] This city was also famous for sharp-edged swords.[31]

Religious history.

The sixteen brahmin pupils of Bāvari visited Vedisa among other places.[32] The *Skanda Purāṇa*[33] refers to Vidiśā as a *tīrtha* or holy place which should be visited after visiting Someś-vara. There were 18 donors belonging to Vidiśā who contributed substantially towards the construction of Buddhist religious edifices at Bhilsa.[34] In the Bārhut Stūpa the Votive label on the Pillar No. 1 shows that it was the gift of Cāpādevī, wife of Revatimitra, a lady from Vidiśā.[35] There are also references to the gift of Vāśiṣṭhi, the wife of Veṇimitra from Vidiśā;[36] the gift Phagudeva from Vidiśā; the gift of Anurādhā from Vidiśā;[37] the gift of Āryamā from Vidiśā;[38] and the gift of Bhūtarakṣita from Vidiśā.[39] The Nīlakaṇṭheśvara temple at Udayapur in Bhilsa has been referred to in the Udayapura *praśasti* which is engraved on a slab of stone.[40] The Vedisagirimahāvihāra which is said to have been built by Aśoka's wife Devī for the residence of her

---

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 643.

[30] Schoff, *The Periplus of the Erythraean sea*, pp. 47, 253.

[31] *Jāt.*, III, 338—*Dasaṇṇakaṃ tikhiṇadhāraṃ asiṃ.*

[32] *Suttanipāta*, vs. 1006—1013.

[33] Vaṅgabāsī Ed., pp. 2767-68.

[34] Luders' List, Geographical Index for references.

[35] Barua and Sinha, *Barhut Inscriptions*, p. 3—*Vedisā Cāpādevāya (Cāpadevāyā) Revatimitabhāriyāyā paṭhamo thabho dānaṃ.*

[36] Barua and Sinha, *Barhut Inscriptions*, p. 35—*Vedisā Vāsiṭhiyā Velimitabhāriyāya dānaṃ.*

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 14—*Vedisā Phagudevasa dānaṃ; Vedisā Anurādhyāya dānaṃ.*

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 17—*Vedisā Ayamāya dānaṃ.*

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 20—*Vedisāto Bhūtarakhītasa dānam.*

[40] *Epigraphia Indica*, I, 233.

son,[41] was probably the first Buddhist religious foundation which was followed by the erection of Stūpas at Sāñchī, five and a half miles south-west from Bhilsa. Mahinda the son of Aśoka by Devī stayed in this monastery for a month.[42] He came here to see his mother who welcomed her dear son and fed him with food prepared by herself.[43] He went to Ceylon from the Vedisa mountain.[44] Vedisa also contained a monastery called Hatthāḷhakārāma.[45]

Vidiśā is well known for its topes which include (1) Sāñchī topes, five and a half miles to the south-west of Bhilsa; (2) Sonāri topes, six miles to the south-west of Sāñchī; (3) Satdhāra topes, three miles from Sonāri; (4) Bhojpur topes, six miles to the south-south-east of Bhilsa; and (5) Andher topes, nine miles to the east-south-east of Bhilsa.[46] Revatimitra was probably a member of the Śuṅga-Mitra family stationed at Vidiśā.

Besnagar Inscription on a stone column.

The inscription on a stone column at Besnagar, discovered by J. H. Marshall, Director General of Archaeology in India, records the erection of a column surmounted by *Garuḍa* in honour of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva by the Greek ambassador Heliodoros, son of Dion, when he had been crowned twelve years.[47] Heliodoros, an inhabitant of Taxila, was sent by the Greek king Antialcidas to the court of king Kautsiputra-Bhagabhadra who was apparently reigning at Vidiśā. Although a Greek he was called a Bhāgavata, who, according to V. A.

[41] *Thūpavaṃsa*, p. 44.

[42] *Dīpa*, VI. 15; XII. 14, 35; *Samantapāsādikā* I, 70, 71; Cf. *Mahāvaṃsa Commy.*, p. 321.

[43] *Mahāv*. Ch. 13 vs. 6–11; *Dīpa*, Ch. 6. 15-17; Ch. 12. v. 14.

[44] *Mahābodhiv*. 116; *Thūpv*. 43.

[45] *Mahābodhivaṃsa*, p. 169.

[46] *Cunningham, Bhilsa Topes*, p. 7.

[47] *Archaeological Survey Report*, I, 1913-1914, Pt. II, p. 190.

Smith, is credited with a long reign of thirty-two years.[48] On this column he caused to be incised some teachings of his new religion which he probably embraced at Vidiśā. These teachings are contained in the two lines engraved on the other side of the column. The Bhāgavata of the Purāṇas may be the corrupt form of Bhāgabhadra who was a Śuṅga prince reigning at Vidiśā, probably as *yuvarāja*, just as one of his predecessors Agnimitra was during the reign of his father Puṣyamitra, as we learn from Kālidāsa's *Mālavikāgnimitra*. Bhāgavata, i.e., Bhāgabhadra has been assigned by V. A. Smith to circa 108 B. C.[49] The attention of J. H. Marshall who examined the ancient site of Vidiśā was drawn to a stone-column standing near a large mound, a little to the north-east of the main site, and separated from it by a branch of the Betwa river. The shaft of the column is a monolith, octagonal at the base, sixteen sided in the middle, and thirty-two sided above with a garland dividing the upper and middle portions. The capital is of the Persepolitan bell-shaped type with a massive *abacus* surmounting it, and the whole is crowned with a palm-leaf ornament of strangely unfamiliar design. This column has been worshipped by pilgrims from generation to generation. Marshall thinks that the column was many centuries earlier than the Gupta era.[50] King Bhāgabhadra mentioned in the inscription was the son of a lady belonging to Benares (*Kāśīputrasa*). Fleet has taken *Kāśīputrasa* to mean that he was the son of a lady of the people of Kāśī, or the son of a daughter of a king of Kāśī.[51]

---

[48] *Early History of India,* 4th Ed., p. 214.

[49] *J.B.B.R.A.S.,* Vol. XXIII, pp. 104–106.

[50] *JRAS.,* 1909, pp. 1053–56.

[51] *Ibid.,* 1910, pp. 141-42.

The Śākyas took shelter at Vidiśā being afraid of Viḍūḍabha.[52] Aśoka halted at the city of Vidiśā, while he was on his way to Ujjayinī to join the post of Maurya viceroy (*uparājā*) of Avantī.[53] Here he married Devī, who was endowed with signs of great persons and a young daughter[54] of a banker named Deva belonging to Vidiśā. According to the *Mahābodhivaṁsa* (pp. 98, 110) she was honoured as Vedisamahādevī and was represented as a Śākya princess. Devī was taken to Ujjayinī where she gave birth to a son named Mahinda and two years later, a daughter named Samghamittā.[55] Devī stayed at Vidiśā, but her children accompanied their father when he came to Pāṭaliputra and seized the throne. Samghamittā was given in marriage to Agnibrahmā, a nephew of Aśoka (*bhāgineyyo*-sister's son),[56] and a son was born to them called Sumana. Dr. Barua rightly points out that the Sanskrit legends and the inscriptions of Aśoka are silent on this point.[57] Vedisamahādevī was by his side at the time of Aśoka's coronation.[58] Dr. Barua thinks that the Vidiśā residence of Devī favours the idea of having separate family establishments for individual wives at different towns.[59]

Political history.

The Besnagar inscription testifies to the existence of

---

[52] *Mahābodhivaṃsa*, p. 98.

[53] *Samantapāsādikā*, I, p. 70.

[54] *Mahāvaṃsa Commy.*, I, p. 324— *Vedisagirinagare Devanāmakassa seṭṭhissa ghare nivāsaṃ upagantvā tassa seṭṭhissa dhītaraṃ lakkhaṇasampannaṃ yobbanappattaṃ Vedisadevīṃ nāma kumārikaṃ disvā tāya paṭibaddhacitto mātāpitūnaṃ kathāpetvā taṃ tehi dinnaṃ paṭilabhitvā tāya saddhiṃ saṃvāsaṃ kappesi.*

[55] *Mahābodhivaṃsa*, 98-99; *Thūpav.*, 43.

[56] *Mahāvaṃsa*, V, p. 169.

[57] *Aśoka and his Inscriptions*, pp. 51-52.

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 53.

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 53.

diplomatic relations between the Greek king of Taxila and the king of Vidiśā.[60] The *Raghuvaṃśa* (XV. 36) says that the two sons of Śatrughna named Śatrughātin and Subāhu, were put in charge of Mathurā and Vidiśā. Avīkṣit, son of Karandhama, the ruler of Vaiśālī, had a great conflict with the king of Vidiśā and was captured. Karandhama rescued his son. Pargiter holds that the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* (121-31) makes this conflict grow out of a *svyamvara* at Vidiśā.[61] About the time of Karandhama, the ruler of Vaiśālī, Parāvrit, king of the Yādava branch, placed his two youngest sons at Vidiśā and not in Videha.[62]

It is with the kingdom of Vidiśā that the Śuṅgas are especially associated in literature and inscriptions.[63] The *Mālavikāgnimitra* refers to the love of Agnimitra, king of Vidiśā and a viceroy of his father Puṣyamitra,[64] for Mālavikā, a princess of Vidarbha (Berar) living at his court in disguise. There was a war in 170 B. C. between Vidiśā and Vidarbha in which the former was victorious. Mādhavasena, a cousin of Yajñasena and a partisan of Agnimitra, was arrested and kept in custody by Yajñasena's warden, when the former was on his way to Vidiśā. This led the Śuṅga monarch Agnimitra to ask Vīrasena to attack Vidarbha. Yajñasena was defeated and the kingdom of Vidarbha was divided between the two

---

[60] *Cambridge History of India,* p. 558.

[61] *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition,* p. 268 f. n. 4.

[62] *Ibid.,* pp. 268-69. The *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* (Canto CXXII, vs. 20-21) makes this point clear by relating that when Vaiśālinī, the daughter of the Vaidiśa king named Viśāla, was waiting for the proper moment at her *svayamvara,* Karandhama's son named Avīkṣita carried her off. The same *Purāṇa* further relates that Avīkṣita was captured by unrighteousness. All the kings in company with king Viśāla entered the Vaidiśa city cheerfully, taking him bound.

[63] *JRAS.,* 1909, pp. 1053—56.

[64] *Mālavikāgnimitra,* Act. V. 20.

cousins.[65] After ruling Vidiśā as his father's viceroy, Agnimitra was his successor as suzerain for eight years.[66]

The king at Vidiśā was the son of Kāśī, i.e., a princess from Benares.[67] The Śuṅgas ruled originally as feudatories of the Mauryas at Vidiśā.[68] Both Puṣyamitra and Agnimitra belonged to Vidiśā.

The Purāṇas preserve a tradition which avers that when the Śuṅga rule ended, one Śiśunandi began to rule Vidiśā. They lead us to think that the residual power of the Śuṅgas lingered at Vidiśā side by side with the suzerainty of the Kānvas. It is generally assumed that at first Vidiśā and subsequently Ujjayinī became the official headquarters of Candragupta II.[69]

Coins at Vidiśā.

In ancient Vidiśā copper *kārṣāpaṇa* was the standard money from slightly before the rise of the Mauryas to at least the beginning of the Gupta supremacy, i.e., for upwards of 600 years.[70] Punch-marked coins were found at Besnagar (ancient Vidiśā) which had its own individual marks on its coinage. They contained strata reaching down to the 4th century A. D.[71] The *kārṣāpaṇas* found at Besnagar seem to have been struck on river bank. A zig-zag sign appears on them denoting a river bank.[72] Dr. Bhandarkar opines that owing to the enhancement of the price of copper the weight of copper *kārṣāpaṇas* was reduced at some periods in the ancient town of Vidiśā.[73]

---

[65] Law, *Indological Studies*, Pt. I, p. 50.
[66] *CHI.*, p. 520.
[67] *Ibid.*, p. 522.
[68] *Ibid.*, p. 522.
[69] Raychaudhuri, *Political History*, p. 468.
[70] Bhandarkar, *Carmichael Lectures*, 1921, p. 88.
[71] *Ibid.*, p. 185.
[72] *Ibid.*, pp. 100-101.
[73] *Ibid.*, p. 161.

PHILOSOPHY OF GAUḌAPĀDA (ALĀTAŚĀNTI-PRAKARAṆA)

By Jnanendralal Majumdar

(Continued from Vol. VIII, Part 4, p. 370)

Śaṅkara's Commentary

It is not our purpose here to give a detailed criticism of what is commonly known as Śaṅkara's commentary on the Alātaśanti-prakaraṇa. We shall only give a few examples of how, owing to his ignorance of the Mahāyāna, the commentator thoroughly misunderstood Gauḍapādā's purpose :

1. In verse I, Gauḍapāda lays down the Mahāyāna doctrine that in transcendental knowledge all things are one with the Ultimate Reality and pays obeisance to Gautama Buddha for having formulated it. He uses the term *Sambuddha* (fully enlightened) by which Gautama always used to be designated by his followers. But all this Śaṅkara did not know. It is worth comparing Gauḍapāda's expression of obeisance with Nāgārjuna's expression of obeisance to the Buddha :[1]

Gauḍapāda says :—यः सम्बुद्धस्तं वन्दे द्विपदां-वरम।

Nāgārjuna says :—यः सम्बुद्धस्तं वन्दे वदतां-वरम्।

2. Commenting on verse 19, Śaṅkara interprets the term *buddha* as learned man, not knowing that there was such a doctrine as Mahāyāna attributed to Buddha Gautama of which *Ajāti* or non-birth of things was the essential idea.

3. Not knowing that in Mahāyāna Buddhism existence (*Astitā*) was classified under three heads, namely Parikalpita, Paratantra and Pariniṣpanna, of which Paratantra, meant mutually dependent, Śaṅkara explained

[1] *Vide*, p. xii.

paratantra in verses 24 and 73-74 as *anyaśāstra*, that is, another śāstra.

4. Not knowing Mahāyāna, Śaṅkara thought that verse 28 was an attask on Vijñānavāda and Śūnyavāda.

5. The same ignorance was responsible for his not seeing that in verse 42, the term *buddha* referred to Buddha Gautama.

6. Not knowing that Lakṣaṇaśūnyatā was one, indeed, the very first, of the seven kinds of Śūnyatā or emptiness taught in Mahāyāna Buddhism, Śaṅkara, in interpreting verse 67, had to give the expression *tanmatena* a far-fetched meaning instead of the natural meaning "in this doctrine".

7. The mistake about the term *buddha* is, in a modified form, repeated in the interpretation of verse 80.

8. In reading verse 81 Śaṅkara had to split up the term *Dharmadhātu* so that the expression *Dharmadhātuḥ svabhāvataḥ* became, in his hand, *Dharmo dhātusvabhāvataḥ*, because he did not know that Dharmadhātu was a name given to the Ultimate Reality in the Mahāyāna.

9. Not knowing that it was a fundamental princi ple in the Mahāyāna that the Ultimate Reality was free from the four propositions of existence, non-existence and so forth, Śaṅkara had to give verse 83 a forced interpretation.

10. The same thing happened in his interpretation of verses 87 and 88, because he did not know that the tripartite division of knowledge was Buddhist, although Gauḍapāda distinctly acknowledges it.

11. That Śaṅkara failed to grasp the significance of the term Agrayāna in verse 90, leads one to think that he had not even heard that there was any such thing as Mahāyāna.

12. It is clear from the above why in interpreting verse 99 he had to transpose a *na* in order to say that the Buddha did not teach what was actually his teaching.

All this is based on the supposition that the great Śaṅkara who wrote the commentaries on the *Brahmasūtra*, the Upaniṣads and the *Gītā* was also the author of the commentary on the *Kārikās* of Gauḍapāda on the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. It may, however, be said that the commentary on the *Kārikās* is not his, but of some other person, possibly one of his successors to his *gaddi* who all assume the title of Śaṅkara even up to the present time. The commentary is so meagre, halty, defective, evasive and inelegant that it is unworthy of even a much lesser intellect than that of the renowned Śaṅkara. The stamp of his forceful logic and lucid interpretation is quite patent on the commentary on the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* itself but not on that on the *Kārikās*. We can, therefore, safely absolve Śaṅkara of having written the almost foolish commentary on the *Kārikās*, specially on the fourth chapter, the Alātaśāntiprakaraṇa.

Of course, he knew the *Kārikās*, for he quoted from them and quoted as his only authority on the main planks of his Māyāvāda. In discussing an interpretation of the ten Upaniṣads from the standpoint of Māyāvāda or Vivartavāda a few fundamental questions present themselves: (1) The ten Upaniṣads nowhere clearly state the vivarta idea, never even citing an example of vivarta such as rope-snake. On the contrary they have everywhere sought to explain the creation by clear examples of pariṇāma such as earth, earthen-ware and the like. It would seem as if their author or authors never conceived the idea of error (*bhrama*) or illusions in respect of the creation of the world. (2) If the world is māyika (illusory) then the states of bondage and liberation with which religion and philosophy deal, must also be illusory or unreal or rather the chains of worldly bondage with which a jīva considers himself bound exist nowhere but in his fancy, he being in reality eternally liberated but dreaming of bond-

age under the influence of māyā, the inscrutable and yet unreal creative energy which knows no beginning but has an end. The Upaniṣads, however, nowhere clearly speak of the world as a dream of the jīva's māyika sleep. (3) If the world is unreal, then this unreality must be demonstratable in some state of his worldly experience, waking, dreaming or sleeping. According to the Māyāvāda it is clearly demonstratable in the dreaming state. But the Upaniṣads nowhere put forth any argument to establish this point. The Māyāvādin has, therefore, himself to find his arguments for establishing it.

In answering all these questions from his standpoint of Māyāvāda, Śaṅkara had to depend solely on the authority of Gauḍapāda as an interpreter of the Śruti. On the first question he quotes, in his commentary on the *Brahmasūtra* 1-4-14, the 15th verse of the 3rd chapter of the *Kārikās* named Advaitaprakaraṇa:

मृल्लोहविस्फुलिंगाद्यैः सृष्टिर्या चोदितान्यथा ।
उपायः सोऽवताराय नास्ति भेदः कथंचन ॥

"As regards the statement of creation in a different way by (the examples of) earth, gold and sparks of fire, it is only a means for introducing the fact that there is no diversity in the least." On the second question he quotes, on the *Brahmasūtra* 2-1-9, the 16th verse of the first chapter of the *Kārikās* named Āgamaprakaraṇa:

अनादिमायया सुप्तो यदा जीवः प्रबुध्यते ।
अजमनिद्रमस्वप्नमद्वैतं बुध्यते तदा ॥

"When the jīva, sleeping under the influence of unbeginning māyā, wakes then is understood non-dualism which is unborn, unsleeping and undreaming".

On the question, all the arguments of Śaṅkara to establish that a dream is nothing but a māyā are taken from the second and fourth chapters of the *Kārikās*. The following table will show this:

Brahmasūtra 3-2-3, *Śaṅkara's commentary*

१. न तावत् स्वप्ने रथादीनामुचितो देशः सम्भवति। न तावत् संवृते देहदेशे रथादयोऽवकाशं लभेरन्।

In a dream it is not possible for chariots etc. to have adequate room. For in the restricted room within the body chariots etc. cannot get space enough (to exist as real objects).

२. स्यादेतत्। वहिर्देशात् स्वप्नं द्रक्ष्यति देशान्तरितद्रव्यग्रहणात्। × × नेत्युच्यते। न हि सुप्तस्य जन्तोः क्षणमात्रेण योजनशतान्तरितं देशं पर्येतुं विपर्येतुं च ततः सामर्थ्यं सम्भाव्यते। क्वचिच्च प्रत्यागमनवर्जितं स्वप्नं श्रावयति "कुरुष्वहं शय्यायां शयानो निद्राभिप्लुतः स्वप्ने पञ्चालानभिगतश्चास्मिन् प्रतिवुद्धश्च" इति। देहाच्चेदपेयात् पञ्चालेष्वेव प्रतिवुध्येत तानसावभिगत इति कुरुष्वेव तु प्रतिवुध्यते।

It may be said that one sees a dream from an outer place, for he sees objects lying in another place. But it cannot be so, for the sleeping creature cannot possibly have the power to go to and return from a place, situated a hundred yojanas off, in a moment. Sometimes we hear of a dream in which there is no return even.

Gauḍapāda's Māṇḍūkya-Kārikās

१. वैतथ्यं सर्वभावानां स्वप्न आहुर्मनीषिणः।
अन्तःस्थानात्तु भावानां संवृतत्वेन हेतुना ॥२।१

Wise men have spoken of the unreality all objects in a dream, for such objects appear within (the dreamer) where accommodation restricted.

२. अदीर्घत्वाच्च कालस्य गत्वा देहान्न पश्यति।
प्रतिबुद्धश्च वै सर्वस्तस्मिन् देशे न विद्यते ॥२।२

And on account of the time (taken by dream) not being long the dreamer does not see (dream-objects) by going out of his body. And on waking he does not find himself in that place.

"Lying in bed in the Kuru land I slept and dreamt that I had gone to the Pāñcāla land, and immediately awoke". Had he gone out of his body he should have awakened in the Pāñcāla land for he had gone there, but he awakes in the Kuru land.

३. येन चायं देहेन देशान्तरमश्नुवानो मन्यते,
तमन्ये पार्श्वस्थाः शयनदेश एव पश्यन्ति।

Again, the body by which he thinks to have repaired to another place is seen by people by his side to lie in the place where he went to bed.

४. यथाभूतानि चायं देशान्तराणि स्वप्ने पश्यन्ति न तानि तथाभूतान्येव भवन्ति। परिधावंश्चेत् पश्येज्जाग्रद्वस्तुभूतमर्थमाकलयेत्।

Again, the other places which he sees in a dream are not such as they really are. Had he seen them by going (to them) they should have appeared exactly as in the waking state.

५. कालविसम्वादोऽपि च स्वप्ने भवति। रजन्यां सुप्तो वासरं भारते वर्षे मन्यते। तथा मुहूर्तमात्रप्रवर्तिनि स्वप्ने कदाचित् बहून् वर्षपूगानतिवाहयति।

३. स्वप्ने चावस्तुकः कायः पृथगन्यस्य दर्शनात्। ४।३६

In a dream the body (i.e., the dream body) is a nothing, for another (i.e., the body of the waking state) is seen separately.

४. मित्राद्यैः सह संमन्त्र्य सम्बुद्धो न प्रपद्यते। ४।३६

After a conversation with friends and others (in a dream) the awakened person does not find (them).

५. न युक्तं दर्शनं गत्वा कालस्यानियमाद् गतौ। ४।३४

Again, incongruity of time also occurs in a dream. A man sleeping at night in India thinks that it is then day there. Similarly, in a dream lasting not longer than a moment one sometimes lives many years.

६. करणोपसंहाराद्धि नास्य रथादिग्रहणाय चक्षुरादीनि सन्ति। रथादिनिर्वर्तनेऽपि कुतोऽस्य निमेषमात्रेण सामर्थ्यं दारूणि वा।

If the senses are withdrawn (in a dream), one has not eyes and so forth to perceive chariots etc. Whence again has one the capacity or the materials (lit. wood) to build chariots etc. in a moment.

७. बाध्यन्ते चैते रथादयः स्वप्नदृष्टाः प्रबोधे।

Again, on waking these chariots etc., seen in a dream, are missing.

८. स्वप्न एव चैते सुलभबाधा भवन्त्याद्यन्तयोर्व्यभिचारदर्शनात्।

Again, in the dream itself they are easily missed, because their beginning and end are not visualised

It cannot be argued that the sight takes place after going to them, for there is an absence of any law of time in the going.

६. उत्पादस्याप्रसिद्धत्वादजं सर्वमदाहृतम्। ४।३८

Everything (in a dream) is said to be unborn because birth (of objects) is not known (or proved there.

७. गृहीतञ्चापि यत्किञ्चित् प्रतिबुद्धो न पश्यति। ४।३५

And the awakened person does not also see the thing that he grasped (in a dream).

८. आदावन्ते च यन्नास्ति वर्तमानेऽपि तत्तथा।
वितथैः सदृशाः सन्तोऽवितथा इव लक्षिताः॥

२।६; ४।३१

What is non-existent in the beginning and in the end is also so in the present. Being like unto unrealities they appear as realities.

९. स्पष्टञ्चाभावं रथादीनां स्वप्ने श्रावयति शास्त्रं "न तत्र रथा न रथयोगा न पन्थानो भवन्ति" इत्यादि।	९. अभावश्च रथादीनां श्रूयते न्यायपूर्वकम्।
From the Śāstra also we clearly hear of the non-existence of chariots and so forth in a dream, as, "There are no chariots, no horses, no roads etc."	The non-existence of chariots and so forth (in a dream), logically established, is also heard (from the Śāstra).
१०. तस्मान्मायामात्रं स्वप्नदर्शनम्।	१०. तस्मादाद्यन्तवत्त्वेन मिथ्यैव खलु ते स्मृताः। २।७; ४।३२
Hence the seeing of a dream is a mere māyā.	Hence, as they (in a dream) have a beginning and an end, they are rightly considered as false.

Above in the left-hand column I have noted all the arguments, seriatim, advanced by Śaṅkara in his commentary on the *Brahmasūtra*[2] and in the right-hand column the corresponding Kārikās from the Vaitathya (2nd) and Alātaśānti (4th) Prakaraṇas. It is clear from even a cursory comparison of the two columns that Śaṅkara's arguments are no more than mere paraphrases of the *Kārikās* quoted.

It is settled, therefore, that Śaṅkara knew the *Kārikās*. In fact, from the *Kārikās* he got his inspiration.

A rather vexed question, according to the present standard, arises from Śaṅkara's never having acknowledeged his indebtedness to Gauḍapāda by name. Such was the habit of our ancient scholars who perhaps used to think that their readers must always be learned enough not to require such acknowledgments. In the present case at least that certainly seems to have been Śaṅkara's idea. In the verse quoted above from the 3rd chapter of the *Kārikās* he acknowledges as, "सम्प्रदायविदो वदन्ति" i.e., those who know the (Advaita) sects say, and the verse, also quoted above, from the 1st chapter of the *Kārikās* is acknowledged as "वेदान्तार्थसम्प्रदायविद्भिराचार्यैः :" i.e. "The teachers who know the sect (which is possessed) of the (true) meaning of the Vedānta speak thus in this connection". Thus Śaṅkara acknowledges his indebtedness to Gauḍapāda using, as usual, the honorific plural. There is, however, no such acknowledgment for his arguments on the subject of dream. This was perhaps due to the fact that they were arguments—not verbal quotations—which he thought were the settled arguments of the sect to which Gauḍapāda belonged. In this estimation of Gauḍapāda he was partially correct. He was correct in that Gauḍapāda was not the originator of the

[2] III, 2, 3.

main theme of the *Kārikās*, Advaitavāda or Māyāvāda, and incorrect in that the sect which developed pure Advaitavāda was not Vedāntic but Buddhistic and that perhaps, so far as we know, Gauḍapāda was the first to advance such arguments to establish the unreality of dream-objects.

It is thus quite evident that Saṅkara knew all the four chapters of the *Kārikās*, no matter whether he was their commentator or not. It is, however, certain that he could not make out the true import of the fourth chapter, the Alātasántiprakaraṇa, and this he could not possibly do without being acquainted with the fullest development of the Śūnya idea among Buddhist philosophers as is contained in the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. His information of the Śūnya doctrine was limited to the perhaps earlier phase of it, associated with the name of Nāgārjuna, which speaks of the world as an absolute void without any substratum of reality. Prajñākaramati, in his commentary on Śāntideva's *Bodhicaryāvatāra*[3] puts this view pithily as, "Paramārtha is the higher sense, the pure aspect of things, by the knowledge of which all the kleśas (sufferings) which follow in the wake of desire which veils it, are destroyed. It is the absence of self-nature in all Dharmas. Śūnyatā, Tathatā, Bhūtakoṭi, Dharmadhātu and so forth are its synonyms. The pāramārthika (true) aspects of all things which are created by dependent causation is certainly the absence of their self-nature, for worldly things as they appear are un-born."

(परम उत्तमोऽर्थः परमार्थः। अकृत्तिमं वस्तुरूपं यदभिगमात् सर्वावृतिवासनानुसंधिक्लेशप्रहाणं भवति। सर्वधर्माणां निःस्वभावता। शून्यता तथता भूतकोटिः धर्मधातुरित्यादिपर्यायाः। सर्वस्य हि प्रतीत्यसमुत्पन्नस्य पदार्थस्य निःस्वभावता पारमार्थिकं रूपम्। यथाप्रतिभासं सांवृतस्यानुत्पन्नत्वात्।)[4]

---

[3] Edited by Louis de La Valleé Poussin and published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

[4] Prajñākaramati's commentary on *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, 9–2.

The uselessness of a conception of cittamātra, an ultimate reality, is spoken of in the *Bodhicaryāvatāra* as "ग्राह्यमुक्त यदा चित्तं तदा सव तथागताः। एवं च को गुणो लब्धश्चित्तमात्रेऽपि कल्पिते ॥" ग्राह्यमुक्तमित्युपलक्षणं ग्राहकादिमुक्तमपि वेदितव्यम्——(commentary) "When the mind becomes free from thoughts of subjects and objects then all are Buddhas. If so what more is gained by imagining the existence of cittamātra (Mind only) again." To the logical mind of Śaṅkara, whose best contribution to the realm of philosophy was his masterly interpretation of error as a false appearance on the background of a truth, this doctrine of absolute nihilism as a means of interpreting the world-vision was too foolish and absurd to require a discursive refutation. Hence, after using elaborate arguments to refute the Sarvāstivāda (externalism) and the Vijñānavāda (Idealism) of Buddhist philosophers, he, in his commentary on the *Brahma-Sūtra*[6] dismisses their Śūnyavāda with the following few words: "The doctrine, however, of the Śūnyavādins is opposed to all forms of pramāṇa and so no pain is taken to refute it. Certainly, this world of experience of all people based on all forms of pramāṇa cannot be given denial to without experiencing another principle."[7]

Thus it is certain also that Śaṅkara was not acquainted with the other form of Śūnyavāda in the realm of the developing Buddhist philosophy which spoke of a positive aspect of Śūnya, Paramārtha-āryajñāna-mahāśūnyatā of the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* of which the Alātaśāntiprakaraṇa is a clear exposition. The chain of the development of Advaita philosophy was, therefore, broken to Śaṅkara

---

[5] *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, 9—30.

[6] 11-2-31.

[7] "शून्यवादिपक्षस्तु सर्वप्रमाणविप्रतिषिद्ध इति तन्निराकरणाय नादरः क्रियते। न ह्ययं सर्वप्रमाणप्रसिद्धो लोकस्य व्यवहारोऽन्यत्तत्त्वमनधिगम्य शक्यतेऽपह्नोतुम्।" ——शारीरकभाष्यम्।

and he thus found no other authority than that of Śruti to support Gauḍapāda's position.

In the absence of a correct interpretation of the Alātaśāntiprakaraṇa in accordance with Buddhist philosophy, this chapter of the Gauḍapāda's *Kārikās* remained a queer composition with a peculiar terminology thoroughly unlike that in the Śrauta literature.

The original which alone could have made a correct interpretation possible had been lost to India, perhaps within the period which intervened between Gauḍapāda and Śaṅkara. It has been made possible only recently by the publication of the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* from Chinese sources. Professor Daisetz Yeitaro Suzuki of the Otani Buddhist College, Kyoto, Japan has placed all scholars of philosophy under a deep debt of obligation by publishing, in 1932, a translation of this wonderful and invaluable book.

As regards the antiquity of the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*, it needs only to be said that its first translation into Chinese was attempted as early as 443 A.D.[8]

Mādhavācārya in his *Sarvadarśanasaṅgraha* quotes a line from what he calls *Laṅkāvatāra* which, if it is at all in the original *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* as has been found in China, must, in the absence of a more intimate knowledge of the book in India, be supposed to have been taken by him from some earlier quotation.

The purpose of Satyānanda's commentary on Gauḍapāda's *Kārikās* is to bring to the notice of scholars the extreme likelihood, if not absolute certainty, of the Advaita idea having been originated by Buddhist philosophers. A continuity in the development of Advaita thought is thus established in the history of Indian philosophy. In the absence of a knowledge of such a

---

[8] *Vide* Suzuki's Introduction to his translation, p. xliii.

continuity, the abrupt appearance of Gauḍapāda's Advaitic interpretation of Śruti always remained a mystery, giving rise to various conjectures, puerile and superstitious, amongst sectarians. There remains for the future scholars the arduous task of finding out how from the agnostic teachings of the Buddha was developed through the various scholars of Buddhist thought and in perhaps more than a thousand years, the culminating idea of absolute monism of the *Lāṅkāvatārasutra* which was such a near approach to the Śrauta idea of Brahmahood as to justify an interpretation of Śrauta in its light. If the line can ever be traced· it will open to the eyes of scholars, a glorious vista of a unique progress of human thought, supremely interesting and instructive in the realms of history, philosophy, psychology and, perhaps, even material science.

To any one who has intelligently read the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, the sense of the Alātaśāntiprakaraṇa, carefully read verse after verse, cannot but be patent.

Satyānanda's Sanskrit commentary on Alātaśanti-prakaraṇa for which this introduction was first intended was written in 1935. Some years later, I had the good fortune of being acquainted with the erudite scholar Māhāmahopādhyāya Vidhu Shekhara Bhattacharya. From him I came to know that he too, like Satyānanda, had been carrying on research into Gauḍapāda's philosophy for some years and that the fruits of his labours in this field were going to be published by the Calcutta University under the title "*The Āgamaśāstra of Gauḍapāda*" (C. U. 1943). He was so glad to find that he and Sātyānanda, working independently in the same field, unknown to each other, had arrived on main points at the same conclusions, conclusions of an extraordinary character, that he became eager to see Satyānanda's work also published. Dr. Narendranath Law, the learned and renowned editor of

the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, has kindly undertaken to publish it in his journal. Satyānanda's sincere thanks are due to both. Left to him the work would perhaps never have been published in the present abnormally difficult days.

THE KAUTALYAN RULER*

By Dasharatha Sharma

Views regarding the nature of the Mauryan monarchy must differ according to the varying emphasis laid on the two sources of Mauryan history, traditional and contemporary. To some it appears as constitutional, to others as absolute. But with regard to the Kauṭalyan ruler there need be no two opinions, if we let the *Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra* speak and decide for us whether the monarch was constitutional or autocratic, whether the state he ruled over was *mantri-pradhāna* or *rāja-pradhāna*,[1] and whether he was or was not the source of all governmental activity.

Partly, Kauṭalya's answer to the question is to be found in Book VIII of the *Arthaśāstra*. After discussing a number of views on the comparative seriousness of the calamities befalling the seven elements of the state, the ruler, the minister, the country, the fort, the treasury, the army and the friend, Kauṭalya concludes that no calamity is so great as that involving the ruler, and aptly too, for according to him the most summary exposition of the state is to say that the *rājā* is the *rājya*.[2] He is the primary *Prakṛti* on which depends the character of the rest.[3] His excellence imparts itself to the other *Prakṛtis* and so do his vices too, for the people's badness and goodness, their habits of exertion and negligence, all

* One of the lectures on the *Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra* delivered at the University of Delhi in 1949-1950.

[1] Perhaps the best example of a *mantri-pradhāna* state would be England.

[2] *Rājā rājyamiti prakṛti-saṅkṣepaḥ* (VIII, 2, 1).

[3] *Svāmī ca sampannaḥ svasampadbhiḥ prakṛtīḥ sampādayati. Svayaṁ ca yacchīlas tacchīlāḥ prakṛtayo bhavanti. Utthāne pramāde ca tadāyatatvāt. Tatkūṭasthānīyo hi svāmīti* —(VIII, 1, 15—18)

these depend on the ruler.[4] He appoints the ministers and the *purohitas*, sets in motion the administrative machinery and averts likely calamities. It is again he who dismisses ministers addicted to vices and appoints good ones in their place.[5]

Many other details, too, from the *Arthaśāstra* demonstrate this character of the Kauṭalyan monarchy. Candidates, desirous of securing high posts, sought his favour through the influence of interested friends. Servants studied every action and gesture of his, with a view to finding out whether he was angry or pleased, for "whereas the fire burns a part or whole of the body, if at all, the king has the power either to destroy or to advance them along with their families."[6] Ministers could, of course, give him counsel that was both good and pleasing. But they either refrained from mentioning what was distasteful to the ruler or looked out for a chance when he might be in a mood to listen to their advice.[7]

Specially instructive regarding the king's role in the state is the royal time table furnished by the *Arthaśāstra*.[8]

---

[4] See the last note.

[5] *Mantri-purohitādi-bhṛtya-vargam=adhyakṣa-pracāraṁ puruṣa-dravya-prakṛti-vyasana-pratīkāram=edhanaṁ ca rājaiva karoti. Vyasanīṣu vāmātyeṣv=anyān=avyasaninaḥ karoti.*

— (VIII, 1, 12-13).

[6] *Eka-deśaṁ dahedagniḥ śarīraṁ vā paraṁ gataḥ saputra-dāram rājā tu ghātayed vardhayed vā.* (V, 4, 23)

The whole of the chapter is worth studying regarding the attitude to be adopted by officials towards the ruler.

[7] See verses 18 and 19 of V, 4.

[8] I, 19. A very good summary is the following by Dr. R. K. Mookerji in his *Candragupta Maurya and His Times,* pp. 90-91:

1.30-3 A.M.—Rise from sleep by the sound of music or trumpets; pondering over injunctions of religion and duties for the morrow.

3-4.30 P.M.—Determination of policy and plans and despatch of his secret emissaries in accordance therewith.

4.30-6 A.M.—Company of the sacrificial priest, the preceptor, and the domestic chaplain and receiving their benedictions; interviewing the physician, kitchen officials and astrologers.

The king rose early and slept late, not merely to read and meditate but to attend practically to every matter concerning the state. Almost his first action was to think of the day's business, the second to deliberate on matters of policy and send out emissaries. In the Audience Hall which he occupied for three hours daily, from 6 a. m. to 9 a. m., he looked after the affairs of the people, urban and rural, taking special care to establish personal contact with them. There could be no question of decentralising in this respect, for a king who was either inaccessible to his people or entrusted his work to the officers near himself engendered confusion in business and caused thereby public disaffection.[9] Business of gods, *āśramas*, non-orthodox sects, of Brāhmaṇas learned in the Vedas, of cattle, of sacred places, of minors, the aged, the afflicted and orphans was to be personally attended to by him in

---

6-7.30 A.M.—Attendance at the Hall of Audience and receiving there the reports of his financial and military advisers.

7.30—9 A.M.—Continued attendance at the Hall of Audience where he is to attend to the affairs of the people, urban and rural, giving free access to them.

9—10.30 A.M.—Bath, Meals and study of religious texts.

10.30 A.M.—12 Noon.—Receiving the surplus of gold cash left over from the previous day; attending to the heads of Departments and assigning duties to them.

12—1.30 P.M.—Correspondence by letter with the Council of Ministers; settlement of plans of espionage with the informers.

1.30—3 P.M.—Recreation and Rest and Pondering over his policy.

3—4.30 P.M.—Review of the Army, Elephants, Cavalry and Arsenal.

4-30—6 P.M.—Consultation with the Commander-in-Chief as to his military strength; Evening prayers.

6—7.30 P.M.—Interviews with secret emmissaries.

7.30—9 P.M.—Second bath and meal followed by religious meditation.

9—10.30 P.M.—Retirement for rest to the sound of music.

10.30 P.M.—1.30 A.M.—Sleep.

[9] *Upasthānagataḥ kāryārthināmadvārāsaṅgaṁ kārayet. Durdarśo hi rājā kāryākāryaviparyāsamāsannaiḥ kāryate.* (I, 19, 30-31).

the order enumerated or according to its urgency and gravity. In no case was he to put off an urgent piece of business,[10] for work thus postponed could later on become too hard or impossible to accomplish. Even his *agnyāgāra* was no mere place of worship or sacrifice for him; seated there he looked after the business of ascetics and physicians in the company of his *purohita* and *ācārya*.[11]

Items 4, 7 and 10 in the time table, summarised in footnote 8, show that the ruler kept full control over the two great powers of the purse and the army. It was, as declared by Kauṭalya, necessary for him to have these under himself, if he was to escape troubles, external and internal, specially the extremely dangerous internal ones caused by ministers.[12] Even before taking up the petitions and complaints for the day, he, therefore, listened to the reports of military and financial advisers. After taking his first meal, he received the surplus of gold left over from the previous day. Between 3 and 4. 30 p. m. he reviewed his elephants, cavalry, chariots and arsenal. Immediately after that he saw the Commander-in-chief and consulted

[10] I, 19, 35.

[11] I, 19, 36. That the work of the Mauryan rulers was actually discharged with the expeditiousness enjoined by Kauṭalya might be seen both from the *Indika* and Asokan edicts. Megasthenes states, " The king may not sleep during the day time. He leaves his palace not only in time of war but also for the purpose of judging causes. He then remains in the court for the whole day without allowing the business to be interrupted, even though the hour arrives when he must needs attend to his person " (McCrindle, *Ancient India,* p. 58). Similarly, Asoka laid down, " At all hours, when I am eating or in the inner apartments, or even in the ranches, or in the place of religious instruction or in the parks everywhere, *Prativedakas* are posted with instructions to report on the affairs of my people." (Rock Edict VI, Dr. R. K. Mookerji's translation).

[12] *Ahi-bhayād=ābhyantaraḥ kopo bāhya-kopāt pāpīyān //2// Antarāmātyakopaś c=āntaḥ-kopāt //3// Tasmāt kośa-daṇḍa-śaktim =ātmasaṁsthāṁ kurvīta //5//* (*Arthaśāstra,* VIII, 2).

him about warfare and so forth.[13] Thus the day began and also ended with the consideration of military matters.[14]

Naturally, the ruler could not by himself discharge all this onerous work. He needed assistants; he needed also people to bring him news from various quarters.[15] "Sovereignty", as remarked by Kauṭalya, "is possible only with assistance. A single wheel cannot move. Hence, he shall employ ministers and hear their opinion."[16] The Kauṭalyan ruler implemented this sage counsel by the appointment of *mantrins* and *mantri-pariṣad*. He had, as we might see from the time table, set hours to consult them. He deliberated between 3 and 4. 30 a. m. In his dealings with physicians and ascetics he was, as pointed out above, assisted by the *purohita* and *ācārya*. Correspondence with the absent members of the Council of Ministers was carried on by means of letters, and even the time reserved for recreation in the afternoon could be spent in settling matters of policy.

Of ministers the Kauṭalyan ruler had three or four. It was deemed inadvisable to have one, because consultation with a single person could not only be inconclusive, it could lead also to unrestrained and wilful behaviour on the minister's part. In deliberating with two ministers,

---

[13] *Aṣṭame senāpati-sakho vikramaṁ cintayet* //19// (*Ibid.*, I, 19).

[14] Some idea of the importance attached to the army can be had also from Greek sources. According to Plutarch Candragupta overran the whole of India with an army numbering 600,000. Megasthenes similarly testifies that the Mauryan army which numbered nearly 700,000 was controlled by a commission of 30 divided into six boards charged respectively with the administration of the following departments: Admiralty; Transport, commissariat, and army service; Infantry; Cavalry; War-chariots; and Elephants.

[15] See the following statement of Kauṭalya, "As works do not happen to be simultaneous, are various in form, and pertain to distant and different localities, the king shall, in view of being abreast of time and place, depute his ministers to carry them out. Such is the work of ministers." (I, 9)

[16] I, 7.

there was likelihood of the king being overpowered by their combined action or imperilled by their mutual dissension.[17] With the *Mantri-pariṣad*, however, there was not any restriction about numbers. Its members could number twelve, sixteen, and twenty, as prescribed respectively by the followers of Manu, Bṛhaspati and Uśanas, or even more according to the requirements of the state.[18] In the eyes of Kauṭalya, having a small *pariṣad* was by no means a good qualification for a ruler.[19]

In what relationship did the *Mantrins* and the *Mantri-pariṣad* stand to the ruler? The *Mantrin* was certainly a very important element of the state, more important than even *janapada*, for "all activities proceed from the minister; activities such as the successful accomplishment of the works of the people, security of person and property from internal and external enemies, remedial measures against calamities, colonization and improvement of wild tracts of land, recruiting the army, collection of revenue and bestowal of favour".[20] He could propose even certain conditions before entering on the duty assigned to him.[21] But a minister was, without the least doubt, inferior in authority to his master, the ruler, who could both appoint and dismiss him and make or mar the fortunes of the minister and his relations.[22]

The *Mantri-pariṣad*, the members of which received 12,000 *paṇas* as against the 48,000 given to the *Mantrin*, may be assumed to have been next in importance to the *Mantrin*.[23] Up to the Kauṭalyan period the *Pariṣad* had

---

17 I, 15.
18 I, 15, 53–5.
19 See VI, 1, 3 and 13.
20 VIII, 1, 23-24.
21 See V, 4, 9–12.
22 See footnotes 5 and 6.
23 V, 3. 4 and V, 3, 8.

important functions to discharge. It not merely advised the ruler regarding matters of policy, it helped him also in undertaking new works, completing works which had already been begun, improving works already executed, and finally in bringing works to their highest pitch of excellence.[24] In case of emergency it was a ruler's duty to summon the *Mantrins* as well as the *Mantri-pariṣad* and to put the whole matter before them and to do what the majority advised or what he regarded as an advice that would lead to the accomplishment of the undertaking.[25] Discussion on each occasions appears to have been fair and free, so free in fact that the *Amātyas* needed some courage to put freely their viewpoint before it.[26]

The *Mantri-pariṣad*, too, thus had a very important place in the Kauṭalyan polity. But with the evidence at our disposal it is hardly proper to assert that:

1) the *Mantri-pariṣad* was so powerful that the emperor was virtually deprived of his sovereignty (Jayaswal);[27]
2) the Pariṣad exercised real executive powers and the king was only the nominal sovereign authority (Dikshitar).[28]

Dr. K. P. Jayaswal's opinion, endorsed fully also by Sri V. R. R. Dikshitar, is based on a series of misinterpretations. Dr. K. P. Jayaswal concluded that the king

[24] I, 15, 58.

[25] I, 15, 63-64.

[26] *Mati-karmasu priṣṭhaḥ tadātve cāyatyāṁ ca dharmārtha-saṁyuktaṁ samarthaṁ pravīṇavad a-pariṣad-bhīruḥ kathayet.* —(*Arthaśāstra,* V, 4, 8).

[27] Opinion quoted by Dikshitar, *Mauryan Polity,* p. 96.

[28] Dikshitar, *Mauryan Polity,* p. 97. Prof. Dikshitar even adds, "This reminds us of the present Parliamentary system of Government in Great Britain where the real sovereign authority is the Parliament, though the formal assent of the King is necessary to every administrative measure, including the appointment of higher officials. Nothing more or anything less is implied in the polity of the ancient Mauryas."

was not given even the power of vetoing,[29] on the basis of that very passage which permitted him the option to adopt either the view of the majority or to take a line best calculated to serve his purpose. He conveniently ignored the words, *kārya-siddhikaraṁ vā*.[30] Equally misleading is his translation of Pillar Edict IV, on the basis of which he tried to prove that the *Rājukas* or High Ministers had wrested sovereignty from Aśoka.[31] Actually, the *Rājukas* were not High Ministers; they were only Provincial Governors.[32] They never resisted; it is only a misinterpretation of the passage which makes Dr. Jayaswal think that they did. Nor is there any ground to suppose that *in the twenty-sixth year of his reign*, when Pillar Edict IV was issued, Aśoka was "fallen from position" and "praying" to the people. Such a conclusion goes not only against the translation proposed by most other scholars of Aśokan history, but it leaves out of account also the important fact that the supposed deposition of Aśoka is believed to have occurred one year after Aśoka issued another proclamation, the Pillar Edict VII,[33] in which

---

[29] *Hindu Polity*, Second Edition, p. 288.

[30] He quotes the passage from the *Arthaśāstra* as follows:
"*Ātyāyike kārye mantriṇo mantripariṣadaṁ cāhūya brūyāt/
Tatra yadbhūyiṣṭhāḥ kāryasiddhikaraṁ vā brūyustat kuryāt/*
(*Ibid.*, footnote 17).

The English translation of the passage given in the body of the text is, "When there is an extraordinary matter the *Mantrins* and the *Mantri-Parishad* should be called together and informed. In the meeting whatever the majority decide to be done should be done (by the king)."

[31] See *Hindu Polity*, 2nd edition, pp. 312—314.

[32] This is the general sense suggested by P. E. IV as well as the other edicts in which the word, Rajjuka, occurs. The Rajjuka most probably was, as suggested by Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri, identical with the *agronomoi* of Strabo who are described as superintending the rivers, measuring the land (the primary function perhaps of a *rajjuka*), inspecting the sluices, supervising the huntsmen with power of rewarding or punishing them, collecting the taxes and superintending the occupations connected with land.

[33] "*satavisati-vasābhisitena me iyaṁ dhaṁma-libi likhāpitā*".

he speaks not merely of the various regulations imposed by him but even ordains that his descendants should conform to it and that it must be engraved "where either pillars or stone slabs are (available) in order that this may be of long duration."[34]

Similarly, Dr. Jayaswal fails to bring out the true implication of Rudrādaman I's Junagarh inscription and Aśoka's Rock Edict VI. Rudradāman had the Sudarśana lake repaired, *in spite of the advice of the ministers to the contrary.*[35] The money was spent from the royal i.e., the state treasury,[36] and the undertaking, which was advised against by some amātyas on account of their *anutsāha*, was carried to completion by another who understood perfectly the implications of *artha*, *vyavahāra* and *dharma.*[37] In the case of the Aśokan *Parisā*, rightly regarded by most scholars as a body identical with the Kauṭalyan

---

[34] See the edict, lines 20—22.

[35] *Asminnarthe ca Mahākṣatrapasya matisaciva-karmasacivair amâtyaguṇasamudyuktairapyatimahatvādbhedasyānutsāhavimukhamatibhiḥ pratyākhyātārambham....amātyena Suviśākhena dharmakīrtiyaśâṁsi bharturabhivardhayatānuṣṭhitam.*
—(D. C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, p. 174).

One may mark the force of *api* here. The reason for the ministers being against the repairs was *anutsāha*, a quality which detracted something from their greatness as *amātyas.*

[36] Dr. Jayaswal's contention that the king's personal treasury was different from the state treasury has yet to be proved. The Kauṭalyan *sūtra, Samānavidyebhyas-triguṇavetano rājā*, quoted by him to prove his point, is both incomplete and torn out of its context. The full *sūtra, samānavidyebhyas-triguṇavetano rājā rājasūyādiṣu kratuṣu, rājñaḥ sârathiḥ sāhasraḥ* (V, 3, 23), has been thus explained by Mm. Ganapati Sastri:—

"*Samānavidyā mantri-purohitāḥ tebhyaḥ triguṇavetanaḥ râjā rājasūyādiṣu kratuṣu, ānita iti seṣaḥ/Rājñaḥ sārathiḥ sâhasraḥ, sahasrapaṇaḥ, kratuṣu*"/

For a king as such there could be no fixed salary. All that remained after providing for the servants etc. was his money. The salary mentioned in this *sūtra* is for the *rājās* who, as tributaries, had to attend the *rājasūya* sacrifice.

[37] "*Kulaipa-putreṇāmātyena Suviśākhena yathāvad-artha-dharma-vyavahāra-darśanair anurāgamabhivardhayatā.*" See also footnote 35.

Pariṣad, Dr. Jayaswal misinterprets the edict when he states, "Asoka issued orders regarding his proclamations and sermons and gifts, and the *Parisā* discussed the orders and shelved them. The angry monarch orders that he should be informed when his oral orders are rejected."[38] His idea of shelving or rejection is based on the mistranslation of the Aśokan term *nijhati*, the Sanskrit equivalent of which would be *nidhyapti* and not *nikṣapti* as proposed by him. It is difficult to guess how Dr. Jayaswal ever reached the idea of rejection, for from Buddhist sources we find that *nijhati* merely signified "agreement after full deliberation,"[39] and this appears to be also its sense in P. E. VII.

In the case of Prof. Dikshitar also we find the same tendency to glorify the *Mantri-pariṣad* by misinterpreting passages from the *Kauṭalīya Arthasāstra.* While considering whether the king could or could not act on his initiative he says that the answer to this is to be found in "Kauṭalya's significant statement that the administration of the kingdom is learnt from personal knowledge (pratyakṣa) and from devoted friends (parokṣa), members of the Cabinet to speak in modern political parlance......... In fact he seems to lay emphasis on the fact that the king expected the assistance of *mantrins* and the *purohita* for all *rājakarmas.*"[40] Had Prof. Dikshitar consulted the *sūtras* that follow immediately the statement, *pratyakṣa-parokṣānumeyā hi rajavṛtti*[41] which he purports to

[38] *Hindu Polity,* 2nd edition, p. 309.

[39] "In the Pali Nikayas, Majjhima, I, Kosambika Sutta, and Anguttara, I, Parisavagga, precisely as in RE. VI, the word *nijjhatti* occurs in connection with *vivāda* in a *parisā*. In both the contexts, the two words, vivāda and nijjhatti signify two opposite states of things, whether of disagreement in views or of agreement after proper deliberation." (B. M. Barua, *Inscriptions of Asoka,* Part II, p. 286).

[40] *Mauryan Polity,* p. 128.

[41] *Arthaśāstra,* I, 9, 11,

interpret, he would have found that Kauṭalya at least would have disagreed with him. The Kauṭalyan *sūtras*, explanatory of the one just quoted, are[42] :—

svayamdṛṣṭam pratyakṣam, paropadiṣṭam parokṣaṁ// Karmasu kṛtenākṛtāvekṣaṇamanumeyaṁ// Ayogapadyāttu karmaṇāṁ anekatvād anekasthatvācca deśa-kālātyayo mā-bhūditi parokṣam amātyaiḥ kārayed ity=amātya-karma.// Their English translation would be:

"The work personally supervised is *pratyakṣa*; that one of which he can have knowledge (only) through others is *parokṣa*; that the accomplishment of which may be expected from something already done is *anumeya*. As works do not happen to be simultaneous, are various in forms, and pertain to distant and different localities, the king shall, in view of being abreast of time and place, have the *prokṣa* work done by his ministers. Such is the work of ministers." One reading through this translation would easily realise the restricted sphere of *amātyas'* work in the Kauṭalyan polity. It is not all *rājakarmas* but only the *parokṣa* ones that fall into the ministers' proper jurisdiction.

Nor is it right to assume with Prof. Dikshitar that every administrative act is preceded by deliberation *in a. well-formed council.*[43] The Kauṭalyan *sūtra*, *mantrapūrvāḥ samārambhāḥ,*[44] merely states that works had to be preceded by deliberation, and this deliberation, as pointed out by Kauṭalya himself, could take various forms: "In accordance with the requirements of place, time and nature of the work in view, he (the ruler) may, as he may deem it proper, deliberate with one or two ministers or

[42] *Ibid.*, I, 9, 12–14.

[43] The words " in a well-formed council " are absent from the original *sūtra*. But for this mistranslation we may blame Dr. Shamasastry.

[44] I, 15.

by himself."[45] In fact there was one school of thought, that of Bhāradvāja, which even said, "The king shall secretly deliberate over secret matters; for ministers have their ministers, and these latter some of their own; this kind of successive line of ministers tends to the discloure of counsels."[46] Meetings of the Council, were not perhaps very common, a joint sitting at least of the ministers and the *Pariṣad* being perhaps necessary only in case of emergencies or special occasions.[47]

As regards the *Aśokāvadāna*, which both Dr. Jayaswal and Prof. Dikshitar have relied on, it is futile to quote it in the face of explicit statements in the *Arthaśāstra* which while duly emphasizing the importance of the *Mantrins* as well as the *Mantri-pariṣad*, gives the first place in its polity to the ruler, making him the keystone of the whole state machinery. Tradition of the type represented by the *Aśokávadāna* can be accepted as valid testimony only when it does not come into conflict with contemporary sources of history.

Another body which helped the ruler in overcoming the difficulties of time and space and to discharge his multifarious dutiess was the Intelligence Department.[48] Spies, as so often stated by writers on Indian politics, were the eyes of the ruler;[49] it was through them that the ruler remained in touch with the activities of all he was interested in. Students, desperadoes, female medicants, poisoners, false teachers, recluses, impoverished cultivators, ascetics and even courtesans[50]—these and the like

---

45 Shamsastry, *Arthaśāstra,* 3rd edition, p. 28. I, 15.

46 *Ibid.,* p. 44.

47 Mark the word *ātyāyika* in "*Ātyāyike kārye mantriṇo mantri-pariṣadam câhūya brūyāt.*" (I, 15).

48 See specially Chapters XI–XIV of Book I of the *Kauṭilīya.*

49 Cf. " vṛddhasaṁyogena prajñām *cāreṇa cakṣuṁ* ".
– (*Arthaśāstra,* VII, 1).

50 See the *Arthaśāstra,* Book I, Chapters 7 and 8.

passed on the news through proper channels to the ruler who, as pointed out above, saw his Intelligence officers thrice a day.[51] Of spies some were appointed with the help of the *amātyas*.[52] But there were others who were appointed by the ruler himself and reported to him alone. Among such we might specially count those who spied on the *purohita*, the *senāpati*, the *mantrin*, the *yuvarāja* and the queen,[53] and the *Purohita* etc., we should remember, constituted the Cabinet supposed by Dr. Jayaswal and Prof. Dikshitar to have controlled the state and the sovereign.[54] Classical writers knew of the efficient spy system of the Mauryan empire. Their accounts are wonderfully similar to those of Kauṭalya. Arrian refers to the *Episkopoi* (overseers) "who overlook what is done throughout the country and in the country and make report to the king or the magistrates where the people have a democratic government".[55] Strabo calls them *Ephori* or Inspectors, and states: "They are entrusted with the superintendence of all that is going on, and it is their duty to *report privately to the king*........The best and most faithful persons are appointed to the post of Inspectors."[56] The *Ephori* and

[51] See above the analysis of the royal time table.

[52] "*Upadhābhiḥ suddhamātyavargo gūḍhapuruṣânutpādayet*".
—(*Arthaśāstra*, Book I, Chapter 7).

[53] "*Tān rājā mantri-purohita-senāpati-yuvarāja.....âṭavikeṣu .... apasarpayet*".
—(*Arthaśāstra*, I, 12, 8).

"*aśītikâ puruṣāḥ pancaśatakā striyo vā matapitṛvyañjanāḥ sthaviravarṣavarābhyāgārikaścāvarodhānāṁ śaucāśaucaṁ vidyuḥ sthāpayeyuśca svāmihite.*"
—(*Ibid.*, I, 17, 31).

[54] See K. P. Jayaswal *Hindu Polity*, 2nd edition, Chapter XXX. Actually there was nothing of the cabinet about the *Mantrins* and the *Mantrī-Pariṣad*. There was no joint or collective responsibility; and there appointment and dismissal rested not with the people but with the ruler. There is no indication whatsoever of their having been nominees of *pauras* and *jānapadas*.

[55] Chinnok, *Arrian*, p. 413 (*PHAI*, p. 291).

[56] Hamilton and Falconer, *Strabo*, III, p. 103 (*PHAI*, p. 291).

Episkopoi obviously are Intelligence officers of a high cadre.

We could, on the basis of the *Kauṭilīya*, say many other things about the Kauṭalyan ruler, his education, measures of safety and so forth. But the facts presented above suffice, we believe, to answer the questions that we started with. The ruler was the chief executive; *mantrins*, *purohitas*, the *Mantripariṣad* and the rest of the bureaucracy were there mainly to assist him in his work. He laid down the policy which they executed. He approved or disapproved the schemes that they presented, reserving to himself the right to do what he thought to be the best for the state.[57] He controlled both the purse and the army. He was also the head of the judiciary, with every right to hear any case or complaint he liked. His fiat reigned supreme; none could legally question it. Of the "four legs of law", *dharma*, *vyavahāra* (evidence), *caritra* (customary usage) and *rājaśāsana* (edicts of kings), the last was superior to the rest.[58] Both custom and *vyavahāra* had to yield to *dharma* but not so the royal order. It enjoyed the place of pride in the Kauṭalyan scheme,[59] whenever royal orders and *dharma* came into conflict, it was assumed that the scriptural text supporting the royal edict had been lost; and in doing this Kauṭalya merely followed a principle well-known to *mīmāṁsā* scholars.[60] The ruler without being theoretically a legislator must have been thus the maker of many important rules and regulations; and

---

[57] See above the account of the *Mantripariṣad*.

[58] *Dharmaśca vyavahāraśca caritram rājaśāsanaṁ*
vivādārthaścatuṣpādaḥ paścimaḥ pūrvabādhakaḥ.
—(*Arthaśāstra*, III, 1, 51).

[59] *Saṁsthaya dharmaśāstreṇa śāstraṁ vā vyavahārikaṃ/*
yasminnarthe virudhyeta dharmeṇārthaṁ vinirṇayet//56//
Śāstraṁ vipratipadyeta dharmanyāyena kenacit/
nyāyastatra pramāṇaṁ syāt tatra pāṭho hi naśyati//57//
—(*Ibid.*).

[60] See...............

what the effectiveness of such rules must have been can be realised from the fact that the supreme judge was at the same time the supreme executive. Further, many legislative powers naturally accrued to the ruler by virtue of his being the protector of his subjects from anarchy and *mātsyanyāya*.[61] In the unsettled conditions of the period, the Kauṭalyan ruler had to be a real *dharma-pravartaka*, if he was to ensure the stability of the Indian social order against all foreign incursions, cultural as well as physical. The law laid down by the *dharmaśāstras* was comprehensive enough in some respects but badly defective in others. The growing needs of society needed a better legal system. Hence originated the *kaṇṭakaśodhana* law, administered not by *dharmasthas* but *amātyas* and *pradeṣṭṛs*.[62] Weeding out unsocial and disaffected elements and safeguarding thereby the interests of the merchant, of the labourer and above all of the state led on the ruler's part to an amount of legislative activity of which any legislature of the modern world may be rightly envious.[63] Specially it must have been easy to initiate new laws in freshly conquered parts of the country where the ruler, while giving due respect to well-established customs, took good care to abolish usages injurious to the growth of his revenue

---

[61] See Book I, chapters 4 and 13.

"When the law of punishment is kept in abeyance, it gives rise to such disorder as is implied in the proverb of fishes; for in the absence of a magistrate, the strong will swallow the weak; but under his protection the weak resist the strong."

"People suffering from anarchy, as illustrated by the proverbial tendency of a large fish swallowing a small one, first elected Manu, the Vaivasvata, to be their king.... It is the king in whom the duties of Indra (the rewarder) and Yama (the punisher) are blended and he is a visible dispenser of punishments and rewards."
— (Shamasastry, *Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra*, pp. 8 and 22-3).

[62] Book IV, 1, 1.

[63] *Kāru-rakṣaṇa, vaidehaka-rakṣaṇa, sarvādhikaraṇa-rakṣaṇa*, suppression of rapes and offences known as *aticāra* were among the principal duties of these courts. For a good analysis of their normal business see N. C. Bandyopadhyaya's *Kauṭilya*, pp. 76—79.

and army. Any custom regarded as unrighteous could also be similarly dealt with, and be substituted by manners and customs deemed righteous by the ruler.[64]

Thus every detail of the *Arthaśāstra* bespeaks the sovereign role of the Kauṭalyan ruler;[65] but every detail bespeaks also, we might note before leaving the subject, the Kauṭalyan ruler's high conception of his duties and ready responsiveness to the needs of his people. He had to use *daṇḍa*, of course, to rule the people, but the *daṇḍa* was to be neither arbitrary nor exessive.[66] He nipped disaffection in the bud,[67] regarding the people as his own children.[68] "In the happiness of the people lay his happiness; in their welfare his welfare; whatever pleased himself he was not to consider his good, but whatever pleased his subjects, he was to consider as good."[69] He listened to the advice of his select *amātyas* and *ācārya*, not because it was anything compulsory, but because he believed in having a mentor who could, in secret, admonish him regarding his duties and

---

[64] "*yacca kośa-daṇḍopaghātikaṁ-adharmiṣṭhaṁ vā caritraṁ vā manyeta tadapanīya dharmyavyavyavahāraṁ sthāpayet.*
— (*Arthaśāstra*, XIII, 5, 12).

[65] As good evidence of the Kauṭalyan ruler's sovereign role, we might, besides the facts already referred to above, mention various important privileges enjoyed by him. Any person who aimed at seizure of the kingdom, forced entrance into the king's harem, instigated wild tribes or enemies against the king, or created disaffection in the army or the country was burnt alive from head to foot (IV. 11). Even Brāhmaṇas, whom the Śāstras exempt from capital punishment, could be punished in case of treason; members of other castes were burnt, a Brāhmaṇa was drowned!! Hindu marriages are generally indissoluble. But if a husband were guilty of treason, his wife could renounce him (III, 2). If the woman took part in seditious activities, she lost all her claim to *strī-dhana* (III, 3).

[66] "*Tīkṣṇa-daṇḍo hi bhūtānāṁ udvejanīyaḥ //11// mṛdudaṇḍaḥ paribhūyate //12// yathārhadaṇḍaḥ pūjyaḥ //13//*
(*Arthaśāstra*, I, 4).

[67] See the *Arthaśāstra*, VII, 5.

[68] *Ibid.*, II, 1; IV, 3 etc.

[69] *Ibid.*, I, 19, 39.

responsibilities.[70] He could not afford to be negligent of his work: he was the guardian of the whole social order.[71] The Kauṭalyan ruler, therefore, though very strong, and in some ways unscrupulous too in the maintenance of his position, was 'no sultàn with the sole obligation of satisfying his personal caprice.'[72] He was strong to protect, to befriend the weak, the lowly and the diseased,[73] and strong also to be a *caturanta* ruler, ruling wisely and well his subjects in accordance with *dharma*, custom, evidence and *nyāya*.[74]

---

[70] *Ibid.*, I, 7, 12–14.

[71] See the verses in III, 1.

[72] *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I, p. 491.

[73] *Arthaśāstra*, II, 1.

[74] *Anuśāsadhi dharmeṇa vyavahāreṇa saṁsthayā*
nyāyena ca caturthena caturantāṁ mahīm jayet//55//
—(*Ibid.*, III, 1).

ORIGINAL HOME AND FAMILY OF THE MAURYAS

By KAILASH CHANDRA OJHA

THE Mauryas have played a very important role in ancient Indian history. But unfortunately there is no definite evidence about their original home and family. Their inscriptions, though sufficiently numerous and large, are quite silent about these things. Apart from them, there is no other contemporary archaeological material which may be definite on these points. So we are left to literature alone for information about these things.

There is, no doubt, a good deal of old literature about the Mauryas. But almost all of this literature was put to writing in the books available to us much after their time. During this long period which intervened between the time of the Mauryas and the writing of this literature, this whole mass was floating as tradition. At this time it was freely tampered with by the ecclesiastics and the fiction-writers who are the sole agents to hand it over to us. In their interest these writers have distorted this literature to a very large extent. So much so that it is quite impossible for us at present to separate the original contents of their writings from the conjectural interpolations made by them. Hence it is difficult to arrive at definite historical conclusions about the original home and family of the Mauryas even on the basis of literature.

The literary tradition of the Hindus preserved in several Sanskrit works makes Candragupta, the first ruler of the Maurya dynasty, a member of the Nanda dynasty of Magadha. The *Mudrārākṣasa* calls him not only Maurya-putra[1] but also Nandānvaya.[2] Kṣemendra and Somadeva

[1] *Mudrārākṣasa,* Act II, verse 6.

[2] *Ibid.,* Act IV.

refer to him as Pūrvananda-suta, son of the genuine Nanda, as opposed to Yoga-Nanda. The commentator on the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*[3] says that Candragupta was the son of Nanda by a wife named Murā. Ḍhuṇḍirāja, the commentator on the *Mudrārākṣasa*, informs us on the other hand that Candragupta was the eldest son of Maurya who was the son of the Nanda king Sarvārthasiddhi by Murā, daughter of a Vṛṣala. When Vincent Smith was writing his history, mainly these traditions were known to the historians, and so he adjudged Candragupta to be a scion of the Nanda family.[4] But besides being very late these traditions are mere cock-bull stories, and they cannot be taken to be historical. As Dr. B. M. Barua has said, "The barber-story is almost proverbial in the ancient royal tradition of India. When a reigning monarch was found stingy in the payment of rewards or in making gifts, he was taken to be a barber's son. There must have been some such reason at the back of the Brahmanical tradition regarding the Sudra origin of the Nandas and the Mauryas."[5] Then again, this tradition cannot be accepted now because since Smith wrote his history there have come to light some other traditions which are in conflict with it.

A Jaina tradition recorded in the *Pariśiṣṭaparvan*[6] represents Candragupta as the son of a daughter of the chief of the Vindhyan village of peacock-tamers (Mayūra-poṣaka). Some Buddhist works also confirm this tradition saying that the city of the Mauryas abounded in peacocks, its houses were built in the design of the neck of peacocks and so on.[7]

---

[3] *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, IV, 24-Wilson, IX, 187.

[4] Vincent Smith, *Early History of India*, 1904, p. 110.

[5] *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. X, 1943-4, pp. 30-31.

[6] Page 56; VIII, 229 f.

[7] Turnour, *Mahāwaṅso*, Intro. xxxix f.

Aelian informs us that tame peacocks were kept in the parks of the Maurya palace at Pāṭaliputra. Sir John Marshall along with some other scholars points out that figures of peacock were employed to decorate some of the projecting ends of the architraves of the east gateway of Sāñchī built during the Mauryan period.[8] Dr. Barua has drawn our attention to the fact that the Mauryas liked peacock-flesh so much that peacocks were the last to be prohibited from being killed in Aśoka's kitchen.[9] It is, however, difficult to draw any definite conclusion from all these statements. Even if it be accepted that the Mauryas had some special liking for peacacks, it is difficult to assume that it was due to some sort of original connection of peacocks with the Mauryas. Even if such a connection be accepted, it hardly throws any definite light on the original home and family of the Mauryas. The Jain story is particularly very late, fictitious and unreliable.

According to the Buddhist traditions the Mauryas were Kṣatriya by caste. In the *Divyāvadāna*[10] Bindusāra, the son of Candragupta, claims to be an anointed Kṣatriya Mūrdhābhiṣikta. In the same work[11] Aśoka, the son of Bindusāra, calls himself a Kṣatriya. The *Mahāvanśa*[12] calls Candragupta a scion of the Khattiya clan styled Moriya. In the *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta*[13] the Moriyas are represented as the ruling clan of Pippha-livana which probably lay in the North-Eastern India,[14]

---

[8] *A Guide to Sāñchī*, pp. 44, 62.

[9] *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. X, pp. 32-33.

[10] Cowell and Neil's Ed., p. 370.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 409.

[12] Geiger's translation, p. 27. *Moriyanaṁ khattiyānāṁ vaṁśe jāta.*

[13] SBE., XI, pp. 134-135.

[14] On the ground that Pippalikās (the gold-digging ants) were found in the North-West India, Dr. H. C. Seth places it in that part (*ABORI*, Vol. XVIII, p. 163-4). But it can hardly be accepted. It is conjectural, and it is not likely that a tribe claiming Buddha's corpse

and as belonging to the Kṣatriya caste. The *Mahāvanśaṭīkā* and the *Avadānakalpalatā* connect the Moriyas with the Śākyas, who, as is well-known, were the clan of the Buddha and claimed to belong to the race of Āditya (the sun). This Buddhist tradition is, of course, the earliest tradition about the origin of the Mauryas. Hence it has been accepted to be historical by several recent historians.[15] But as pointed out by many eminent scholars[16] this tradition seems to have been created under the influence of the Buddhist phobia of assigning a high lineage to Aśoka, the great Buddhist monarch, and of connecting Aśoka with the Buddha himself. Like the Hindu and the Jain traditions, it also seems to suffer from the greatest weakness of making an attempt to give a fantastic philological explanation of the title Maurya through the Moriyas so well-known in the Buddhist literature. It does not seem to record the historical facts.

In certain late medieval inscriptions from Mysore the Mauryas are said to be the Kṣatriyas who sprang from Māndhātṛ of the Solar race.[17] It cannot be said if these Mauryas were at all connected with the Mauryas who flourished about two thousand years before them. Even if there be any connection, we can hardly take so late a statement, which does not appear to have been based on any old authority, to be true. It is very likely that it has been taken from the Buddhist legends.

---

should have come from there. The derivation of the word Moriya from the mountain Meru or the Meros of the Greeks or Koh-i-Mor is equally groundless (*Ibid.*). His identification of Śaśigupta with Candragupta also cannot be accepted in view of the fact that classical writers have always made distinction between them (*ibid* and *IHQ*, 1937, pp. 361-2).

15 F. W. Thomas, *Camb. Hist. Ind.*, Vol. I, p. 470; H. C. Roychaudhuri, PHAI[5], pp. 267-8; R. K. Mukerji, *Chandragupta Maurya and His Times*, pp. 22-3; N. N. Ghosh, EHI[2], p. 111 and others.

16 Turnour *Mahāwanso*, Intro., pp. xxxviii-xliii; F. W. Thomas, *Op. Cit.;* H. C. Seth, *ABORI*, Vol. XVIII, p. 160; and B. M. Barua, Ind. Cult., Vol. X, pp. 32-3.

17 *Ep. Ind.*, II, 222.

In the *Rājaputānā Gazetteer*,[18] a Rājput clan has been said to have the name Moris. The Greek writers also have described a tribe with the name Morieis.[19] Evidently there is no ground to connect these tribes with the Mauryas.

Thus we may see that up to this time there is no definitely reliable testimony on the original home and family of the Mauryas. In this background let us draw attention to an unnoticed passage of the *Bhāgavata*, one of the oldest Purāṇas, which clearly states that the Mauryas came of the Kuru family:

मौर्य्या ह्येते दश नृपाः सप्तत्रिंशच्छतोत्तरं
समाः भोक्ष्यन्ति पृथिवीं कलौ कुरुकुलोद्वहः ॥[20]

This statement is quite early. It comes of a work of sober history, and it does not indulge in frivolous tale-telling. It is also free from religious prejudice, and it is not designed to explain the Maurya. We may take this statement to be historical until it is found to involve some weakness. If taken to be so, it shows that the Mauryas originally belonged to the Kurus, a well-known ancient Kṣatriya clan.

The old Kṣatriya tribes of the Kurus lived in Delhi region in the North-Western India, and its branch called Uttara Kuru in the trans-Himālayan region.[21] It is not unlikely that the Mauryas came from these parts. In this connection we would like to draw attention to one other unnoticed pasage of the Purāṇas. Generally, the Purāṇas say that Kauṭilya put Candragupta on the throne:

चन्द्रगुप्तं नृपं राज्ये कौटिल्यः स्थापयिष्यति ।[22]

---

[18] II A, the Mewar Residency, compiled by Major K. D. Erskine (p. 14).

[19] *Camb. Hist. Int.*, Vol. I, p. 470.

[20] Pargiter, *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasty of the Kali Age*, p. 30, f. n. 46.

[21] See H. C. Raychaudhuri, *PHAI*[3], pp. 15-16, 19 etc.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 28, given in the *Vāyu* and the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas*.

Or

कौटिल्यश्चन्द्रगुप्तन्तु ततो राज्येऽभिषेक्ष्यति।[23]

According to Pargiter[24] these texts of the Purāṇas were taken from the *Matsya Purāṇa* which was written earliest of all. The *Matsya* gives the second reading given above. But in some of its manuscripts the last portion of the text reads likes this:

(कौटिल्यश्चन्द्रगुप्तन्तु ततो) राष्ट्रे निवेश्यति।[25]

This reading may be only a corruption of the reading given above. But it is also possible that it is the original reading. If it is so, we may say that Candragupta came to Magadha from outside.

It cannot be said at this stage what will ultimately come out of these statements of the Purānas. It is not impossible that these statements are found to be insufficient on critical examination. But it would not be out of place to point out here that these statements of the Purāṇas come in line with the accounts of the classical writers who provide us by far the earliest, the most undisturbed and the most historical information about the Mauryas. Thus Appian[26] has said that Candragupta, the king of the Indians, dwelt about the Indus when Seleceus invaded India at about 304 B. C. Plutarch[27] also informs that at the time of Alexander's invasion in 326 B. C. Candragupta who was then a lad was in the North-West where he saw Alexander. Justin[28] has given in detail how Chandragupta began his career in the North-West India:

"India after the death of Alexander had shaken, as it were, the yoke of servitude from its neck and put his

---

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 27, given in the *Matsya Purāṇa*.
[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 27, f. n. 1.
[26] *Syr.* 55; *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VI, p. 114; Hult, 35, Ch. XXXIV.
[27] *Life of Alexander*, lxii.
[28] Watson's tr., p. 142 with slight emendations.

governors to death. The author of this liberation was Sandrocottus. This man was of humble origin, but was stimulated to aspire to regal power by supernatural encouragement; for, having offended Alexander by his boldness of speech and orders being given to kill him, he saved himself by swiftness of foot; and while he was lying asleep, after his fatigue, a lion of the great size having come up to him licked off with his tongue the sweat that was running from him and after gently waking him, left him. Being first prompted by this prodigy to conceive hopes of royal dignity he drew together a band of robbers, and solicited the Indians to support his new sovereignty. Some time after, as he was going to war with the generals of Alexander, a wild elephant of great buck presented itself before him of its own accord and, as if tamed down to gentleness; took him on its back and became his guide in the war and conspicuous in fields of battle. Sandrocottus thus acquired a throne when Seleceus was laying the foundations of his future greatness."

Some modern scholars[29] propose to read in this passage 'Nandrum' (Nanda) in place of 'Alexandrum'. Dr. H. C. Rayachaudhuri informs us that this emendation is quite conjectural and modern in its origin.[30] He favours the former text 'Alexandrum' and points out that Plutarch also has said that Candragupta had seen Alexander.[31] Even if the modern emendation of the text be taken to bc correct we see no reason to identify Nandrum with Nanda of Magadha. The classical writers, though freqnently referring to the Magadha family of Nanda, have never mentioned it by the name 'Nanda'. The Indian traditions

---

[29] *Gutschmid, Rhein, Mus.* 12, 261; McCrindle, *The Invasion of India* by Alexander, pp. 327, 407; Smith, EHI[1], 1904, pp. 110 f.n. and others.

[30] Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. II, p. 556 and *PHAI*[5], f. n. 1. See also F. W. Thomas, *CHI*, p. 467.

[31] *PHAI*[5], p. 268.

also have never said that Nanda of Magadha had any state of hostility with Candragupta himself due to latter's boldness in speech. According to it there is only Cāṇakya or Kauṭilya who had personal enmity with Nanda. A glance at the above passage makes it clear that the passage does not seem to have any knowledge of Candragupta's connection with Nanda ruling in distant Magadha. The passage smacks of a local atmosphere. It is said that Candragupta was an ordinary man, probably he was in the service of Nandrum whose displeasure made him run away on foot, he must have gone hardly a few miles when the idea of trying to be himself a sovereign ruler occurred to his mind, probably he carved out a small state for himself and waged a war of liberation against the Greeks. Here there is nothing about Cāṇakya and his revolt against Nanda as given in the Indian traditions.

Justin has said that Candragupta was of 'humble origin'. This has been accepted by historians[32] not necessarily as referring to the low caste of Candragupta. This may have been said only to indicate Candragupta's birth in a non-imperial house. Thus it will not go against the Purāṇic statement that Candragupta was born in the Kuru family of the Kṣatriyas. Megasthenes also makes him coming of the Lunar race.[33]

This Purāṇic and Graeco-Roman testimony for the North-Western home of the Mauryas is confirmed by some other circumstances of the Mauryan history also. These circumstances may very briefly be enumerated in these words of Dr. B. M. Barua :[34]

"To me Candragupta was a man of the Uttarāpatha or Gandhāra, if not exactly of Takṣaśilā. His early

[32] R. K. Mukerji, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 9-10; R. S. Tripathi, *History of Anc. Ind.*, p. 146 and others.

[33] Dr. H. C. Seth, *ABORI*, Vol. XVIII, p. 163.

[34] *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. X, 1943-4, p. 34.

education, military training, and alliances were all in that part of India. He added the whole of the province of Gandhāra and the surrounding tribal states (Punjab and N. W. Frontier Province) to the growing Magadha empire together wth the territories ceded to him by Seleukos Nikator. The love was never lost between this aparānta and the Mauryas. Aśoka's scribes were all persons whose habitual script was Kharoṣṭhī, and his artists were those who were still carrying on the tradition of the architecture of Persepolis."

On the whole the North-Western origin of the Mauryas seems to rest on solid ground. It comes in conflict with only some Indian traditions which connect the Mauryas with the rulers of Magadha or the Moriyas of Pipphalivana or the Myūrapoṣakas of the Vindhyan territories. But this conflict cannot be taken very seriously. All such traditions are undobtedly of a very late date. They are conspicuous by their absence not only in the classical accounts but even in Indian literature of camparatively earlier time such as the old Purānas and the *Mahāvanśa*. They appear to have been created to hide the ignorance of the Indian writers about the original home and family of the Mauryas. We come across such traditions even about the origin of such tribes as the Yavanas, the Śakas and the Huṇas which were definitely of non-Indian origin. To hide their ignorance the old Indian writers have made them the descendants of some Indian personage of high antiquity. Similarly, the late Indian traditions about the eastern origin of the Mauryas, may have been created to explain their origin, unknown to the old writers, from some well-known Indian family. Most of these traditions attempt to make a near approach to the title Maurya. It shows that they are groping in darkness to explain the origin of the Mauryas with its help. Their reading in the orginal form leaves little ground to doubt that they are mere

myths fabricated late after the Mauryas, in almost complete ignorance about them.

To us it seems that Candragupta was an inhabitant of the North-Western India probably born in the Kuru family. As Justin says he turned out the Greeks and became ruler of North-Western India. At this very time Kauṭilya was carrying on a revolt against the unpopular Nanda dynasty of Magadha. He got help from Candragupta and made him the ruler of Magadha as said in the Indian traditions.

SUJĀNADHARMARATNA

By SADASHIVA L. KATRE

Aufrecht makes the following undigested and confused entries concerning the work *Sujāna-dharma-ratna*, its sections (taken as separate works) and author:

CC, I, P. 116[b]—
कृष्णभट्ट
Cāturmāsyaprayoga Bandh. NP. V, 150
Śrāddhadīdhiti. NP. V, 72

P. 117[b]—
कृष्णभट्ट (?)
Samayamayūkha. NW. 90

P. 269[a]—
धर्मरत्न by Bhaiyābhaṭṭa. Burnell 137[a].

P. 417[b]—
भैयाभट्ट son of Bhaṭṭārakabhaṭṭa: Dharmaratna.

P. 665[b]—
श्राद्धदीधिति by Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa. NP. V, 72.

P. 697[a]—
समयमयूख dh. by Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa. NW. 90. Sūcīpatra 36.

CC, III, P. 58[b]—
धर्मरत्न by Baiyābhaṭṭa.[1] AS p. 214 (Samayamayūkha).

As a matter of fact, however, Kṛṣṇabhaṭṭa and Bhaiyābhaṭṭa are one and the same person, and the full title of his work is *Sujānadharmaratna* and not merely '*Dharmaratna*. *Samayadīdhiti* (not *Samayamayūkha*), *Śrāddhadīdhiti*, etc., are only the various sections, designed

[1] This is evidently a misprint for 'Bhaiyābhaṭṭa.'

'dīdhitis', of this *Sujānadharmaratna*. Further, the author's father is not Bhaṭṭārakabhaṭṭa but Prabhākarabhaṭṭa whose title is 'Bhaṭṭa-Bhaṭṭāraka'.[2] All this would be amply borne out by the extracts furnished below. It appears that the responsibility for these errors, confusions and imperfections in *CC* lies mainly with the basic catalogues like Burnell's *Tanjore Catalogue*, etc.

The pertinent entries[3] in P. V. Kane's *Lists of Works and Authors on Dharmaśāstra* seem to be based mostly on Aufrecht's entries reproduced above and they repeat all the errors etc. in *CC*. The only additional detail recorded therein is that *Āhnikadīdhiti* is a section of Bhaiyābhaṭṭa's work.

It appears that our author planned his *Sujānadharmaratna*, like Nīlakaṇṭhabhaṭṭa's *Bhagavantabhāskara*, on an exhaustive and gigantic scale with a view to deal with all the Dharmaśāstra topics in its probable 12 or 14 dīdhitis. However, no MS of the entire work containing all the dīdhitis appears to have been recorded so far. Only three dīdhitis, so far as I could trace, are available through MSS stocked in various Manuscript Libraries till now. They are (i) *Samayadīdhiti*, (ii) *Āhnikadīdhiti*, and (iii) *Śrāddhadīdhiti*.

(i) Although the sequence of the respective dīdhitis is not found explicitly mentioned by the author, the *Samayadīdhiti* is obviously the first and opening section of the *Sujānadharmaratna*. It, like Kamalākarabhaṭṭa's *Nirṇayasindhu* and Nīlakaṇṭhabhaṭṭa's *Samayamayūkha*, evidently deals with the Kālanirṇaya topic of Dharma-

---

[2] Compare the following colophon to Prabhākarabhaṭṭa's *Rasapradīpa* (Princess of Wales Sarasvati Bhavan Texts, No. 12, Banaras, 1925) —इतिश्रीमद्विन्दुवृन्दारकपुरन्दरजगद्गुरुमहामहोपाध्यायभट्टमाधवतनूजनिभट्टभट्टारकभट्टप्रभाकरोन्नीते रसप्रदीपे etc. with the colophons reproduced further on from Bhaiyābhaṭṭa's dīdhitis.

[3] *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. I (Poona, 1930), pp. 569b, 645a, 659b, 687b, 719a.

śāstra. The Sarasvatī Mahāl Library of Tanjore possesses three complete MSS of this *Samayadīdhiti* section only, and not of the entire *Sujānadharmaratna* as one is given to presume from the descriptions of these MSS in P. P. S. Sastri's *Tanjore Sanskrit MSS Descriptive Catalogue.*[4] The MSS are described as each comprising 6825 Granthas in about 268 folios from which fact the *Samayadīdhiti* appears to vie well in respect of bulk with the two great nibandhas on *Kālanirṇaya* mentioned above.

The following extracts wherein the author furnishes details concerning himself and his royal patron are from Tanjore MS *D. C.* Serial No. 18398 :

Beginning :

श्रीगणेशाय नमः ॥

गणेशलक्ष्मीरमणसीतापतिवृषध्वजान् ।
सारदां शारदां नौमि गुरूंश्चाभीष्टसिद्धये ॥१॥

यो बुन्देलकुलेऽभवद्भुवि महावीरो वदान्यो वशी
विज्ञो भूतलभूषणं मधुकरो भूमीमहेन्द्रः प्रभुः ।
तस्माद्योऽजनि वीरसिंहनृपतिः ख्यातो महीमण्डले
येनानेकविधाः कृताः सुमनसां प्रासादपूर्तादयः ॥ २ ॥

प्रतिपर्वं च यस्तुलादिदानान्यतुलानीह चकार वीरवर्यः ।
विबुधानपि संपदा समृद्धान् क्षितिपानामपि पालनं तथा यः ॥३॥

तस्मादजायत समग्रगुणाभिरामः
पित्रा समः सकलशास्त्रविचारदक्षः ।
शस्त्रास्त्रभृद्विविधकाव्यरसप्रवीणः
राजा पहार इति यः प्रथितः पृथिव्याम् ॥४॥

तस्मान्महाराजपहारसिंहाद्धर्मावतारो निलयः कलानाम् ।
विश्वम्भराङ्घ्रिप्रणतः प्रधीर्यो जातः समस्तावनिपालनो यः ॥५॥

---

[4] *Tanjore D. C.* (Sanskrit), Vol. XVIII, 1934, pp. 8607-8608, Serial Nos. 18398, 18399, 18400. I am grateful to Pt. K. Vasudeva Sastri, Research Pandit, Sarasvati Mahal Library, Tanjore, for having supplied to me the correct details regarding the contents of the three MSS and some pertinent verses from the MSS not reproduced in the *Tanjore D. C.*

आयुश्चेच्चिरजीविवद्दशशतान्यास्यानि चेच्छेषवद्
हस्ताश्चेदिह कार्तवीर्यवदहो चेन्मानसं योगिवत् ।
संपच्चेत्सुरराजवत्सुधिषणा चेत्स्याद्बुधाचार्यवत्
संख्यावानपि यस्य नैव सुगुणान्वक्तुं तथापि क्षमः ॥६॥

श्रीबुन्देलकुलोत्तमांगमुकुटालंकारधीरः सुधीः
श्रीमद्रामपदारविन्दनिरतो दारिद्र्यविद्रावणः ।
शौर्याधः कृतफाल्गुनादिवसुधाधीशाग्रगण्योच्चयो
विज्ञः कोऽपि सुजानसिंह इति यः ख्यातो धराधीश्वरः ॥७॥

आस्यं हास्ययुतं वपुः पुलकितं वाक्यं सुधाधःकरं
स्वान्तं मोदमयं च लोचनयुगं स्वानन्दपूर्णेक्षणम् ।
श्रुत्वैवार्थिजनं तदग्रगमनं यस्येदृशी जायते–
ऽवस्था तस्य मयाज्ञया सुकृतिना सत्संप्रदायानुगः ॥८॥

न्याये गौतमतोऽधिकः कणभुजः शास्त्रे कणादः परः
मीमांसाद्वयकाननाद्वयहरिर्वेदान्तसर्वस्ववित् ।
योगे योगविदां वरः कपिलजित्साङ्ख्ये कवित्वे कविः
साहित्येऽनुपमः स्मृतौ मनुसमः शाब्दे च यः पाणिनिः ॥९॥

विश्वामित्रकुलोद्भवो निजकुलोत्तंसः सतामग्रणीः
सर्वानन्दकरः प्रभाकर इति ख्यातः प्रभावाधिकः ।
तस्माद्योऽजनि कृष्णसंज्ञसुमतिः क्षोण्यां सतां संमतः
भैयाभट्ट इतीह तेन विदुषा ग्रन्थोऽयमारभ्यते ॥१०॥

गच्छतः स्खलनं न्यायादिहावद्यं भवेदपि ।
तथाप्ययं शोधनीयो विज्ञैर्न त्वेदमर्थये ॥११॥

तमोमये मम स्वान्ते कथमर्थः प्रकाशताम् ।
प्रभाकरकरासंगो यदि न स्याच्छु मूर्धनि ॥१२॥

सुजानधर्मरत्नाख्यो विख्यातोऽस्तु महीतले ।
रामचन्द्रप्रसादेन कल्पस्थायी भवत्वसौ ॥१३॥

साम्प्रतं तत्र समयः समयदीधितिः ।
निरूप्यते यत्समयमनीषा सुखतो भवेत् ॥१४॥

इह खलु etc.

End :

सुजानधर्मरत्नेऽस्मिन्समयो नाम दीधितिः ।
भैयाभट्टेन विदुषा यथामति विवेचितः ॥

Colophon : इति श्रीमहाराजाधिराजसुजानसिंहादेशान्निर्मिते सुजानधर्मरत्ने भट्टभट्टारकभट्टप्रभाकरसूरिसूनुना भैयाभट्टेन प्रकाशितः समयदीधितिः संपूर्णः ॥ श्रीरामार्पणमस्तु ॥

None of the three Tanjore MSS appears to be dated.

(ii) The *Āhnikadīdhiti* of the *Sujānadharmaratna* is represented by a MS (Accession No. 12524) in the Gaekwad's Oriental Institute, Baroda. The MS is described[5] as consisting of 17 folios comprising 400 Granthas. No further details of the section are furnished and the MS apppears to be undated. Evidently the section deals with the daily rites of Brāhmaṇas and other caste Hindus.

(iii) Only one MS of the *Śrāddhadīdhiti* of the *Sujānadharmaratna* had been recorded by Aufrecht and it, too, appears to have belonged to a private MSS collection in U. P. However, a further MS of the dīdhiti was traced by me in a collection at Saugor (C. P.) and it has since been acquired and stocked in the Manuscripts Library of the *Scindia Oriental Institute*, Ujjain, bearing Accession No. 6185. The MS was scribed[6] in Śaka 1744 (=1822 A. C.) and consists of 117 straw-paper folios of the size $12\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches, each side of the folios containing 11 lines with about 60 Devanāgarī letters of Marathi type written in dark-black ink in each line. The scribe's handwriting is excellent and the MS, comprising over 4800 Granthas, is complete and scribed with utmost caution.

The *dīdhiti*, as its name shows, deals exhaustively with all the ingredients of the topic of Śrāddha (i.e. a periodical rite or ceremony performed in honour of deceased ancestors or relatives) in all its varieties in theory and practice with reference to Brāhmaṇas and other caste Hindus.

---

[5] *Alphabetical List of MSS in the Oriental Institute, Baroda*, Vol. I (1942), pp. 416-417, Serial No. 739.

[6] The scribe's name is not recorded, but the MS was scribed for Nārāyaṇa Dīkṣita Pitre of Saugor (C.P.).

In the course of his technical discussions on knotty points almost at each stage the author abundantly displays his command over Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā systems and conversance with the vast Smṛti and Nibandha literature. Among the works and authors cited by him I could trace the following:

अग्निपुराण, अंगिरस, अत्रि, अन्त्येष्टिपद्धति[7] (नारायणभट्टकृता), अपरार्क, आदिपुराण, आदित्यपुराण, आपस्तम्बसूत्र, आश्वलायन, आश्वलायनगृह्यपरिशिष्ट, आश्वलायनगृह्यसूत्र, इतिहास, उमामहेश्वरसंवाद, उशनस्, ऋग्विधान, ऋष्टाश्रृंग, कण्व, कर्काचार्य, कर्मप्रदीप, कल्पकारिका, कल्पतरु, कल्पलता, कश्यप, काण्व, कात्यायन, कात्यायनगृह्य, कात्यायनसूत्र, कामरूपनिबन्ध, कारिका, कार्ष्णाजिनि, कालतत्त्व, कालहेमाद्रि, कालादर्श, कालिकापुराण, कूर्मपुराण, कौर्म, कौशिक, गरुडपुराण, गर्ग, गारुड़, गार्गि, गार्ग्य, गृह्यसूत्र, गोभिलभाष्य, गोभिलसूत्र, गौतम, गौतमसूत्र, चतुर्विंशतिमत, चतुर्विंशतिस्मृति, चन्द्रकुतूहल,[8] चन्द्रप्रकाश, चन्द्रिका, चमत्कारखण्ड, छन्दोगपरिशिष्ट, छागलेय, जमदग्नि, जातूकर्ण्य, जाबालि, जीवत्पितृकनिर्णय, ज्योतिर्बृहस्पति, ज्योतिःपराशर, दिवोदास, देवल, देवस्वामिन्, देवीपुराण, धर्म, धर्मतत्त्वालोक, धर्मप्रदीप, धवलनिबन्ध, धूम्र, नन्दिपुराण, नागरखण्ड, नारद, नारदसंहिता, नारदीय, नारदीयपुराण, नारायण, नारायणभट्ट, नारायणवृत्ति, निगम, निगमपरिशिष्ट, निर्णयदीप, निर्णयदीपिका, निर्णयामृत, नृसिंहपुराण, पद्मपुराण, पराशर, परिशिष्टप्रकाश, पाद्म, पारस्कर, पारिजात, पितामह, पितृगाथा, पितृयज्ञप्रकरण, पितृव्यचरणाः, पुराण, पुराणसमुच्चय, पुलस्त्य, पृथ्वीचन्द्रोदय, पैठीनसि, प्रचेतस्, प्रजापति, प्रभासखण्ड, प्रयोगपारिजात, प्रायश्चित्तप्रकरण (माधवीय), बह्वृचगृह्यभाष्यकार, बृहद्वसिष्ठ, बृहद्विष्णुपुराण, बृहस्पति, बृहस्पतिस्मृति, बैजवाप, बोधायन, ब्रह्मनिरुक्त, ब्रह्मपुराण, ब्रह्माण्डपुराण, ब्राह्म, भगवतीपुराण, भट्टचरण (=नारायणभट्ट), भविष्य, भविष्यत्पुराण, भविष्यपुराण, भविष्योत्तर, भारत, भार्गव, (गृह्य–)भाष्यकार, भृगु, मदनपारिजात, मदनरत्न, मनु, मरीचि, मलमासनिर्णय, महाभारत, (व्याकरण–) महाभाष्य, मात्स्य, माधव, माधवीय, मानवमैत्रायणीय, मार्कण्डेयपुराण, मिताक्षरा, मेधातिथि, मैत्रायणीयगृह्यपरिशिष्ट, मैत्रायणीयसूत्र, यम, यमसंहिता, याज्ञवल्क्य, रत्नमाला, लघुहारीत, लिखित, लौगाक्षि, वराहपुराण, वसिष्ठ, वह्निपुराण, वाचस्पति, वाचस्पतिमिश्र, वामन, वायवीय, वायुपुराण, वार्त्तिककृत्, विज्ञानेश्वर, विधानमाला, विश्वप्रकाश, विश्वामित्र, विष्णु, विष्णुधर्मोत्तर, वृद्धगार्ग्य, वृद्धमनु, वृद्धयाज्ञवल्क्य, वृद्धशातातप, वैजयन्तीकोष, वैष्णव, व्याघ्रपाद, व्यास, शंख, शंखलिखित,

---

[7] अत एव वचनं भट्टचरणकृतान्त्येष्टिपद्धतौ etc.—Folio 90a.

[8] This *Candrakutūhala* cited on Folio 108b is unknown to Aufrecht's *CC* and Kane's 'List of Works on Dharmaśāstra.'

शतपथ, शम्भु, शाट्यायनि, शातातप, शालंकायन, शिवरहस्य, शिवस्वामिन्, शूलपाणि, शौनक, श्राद्धकल्प, श्राद्धकाशिका, श्राद्धकौमुदी, श्राद्धचन्द्रिका, श्राद्धचिन्तामणि श्राद्धदीपकलिका, श्राद्धप्रकरण (माधवीय), श्राद्धविवेक, श्राद्धहेमाद्रि, श्लोकगोभिल, श्लोकगौतम, षट्त्रिंशन्मत, संवत्सरप्रदीप, संवर्त, संग्रह, संग्रहकार, सत्यव्रत, सर्वज्ञ-नारायणनिबन्ध, सांख्यायन, सांख्यायनगृह्य, सुमन्तु, सौरपुराण, स्कान्द, स्मार्तभट्टाचार्य, स्मृतिचन्द्रिका, स्मृतिदर्पण, स्मृतिप्रदीपिका, स्मृतिरत्नावली, स्मृतिसंग्रह, स्मृतिसमुच्चय, स्मृत्यर्थसार, हारीत, हेमाद्रि. Besides, many anonymous works and authors are quoted under words like अन्ये, अपरे, केचित, स्मृत्यन्तरे, etc.

The author does not slavishly follow any of his predecessors and arrives at his own conclusions on several points. On many such occasions he boldly criticises and refutes the lines of reasoning employed and views arrived at by great Dharma-Nibandhakāras, like Vijñāneśvara, Lakṣmīdhara, Hemādri, Śūlapāṇi and others. None of the numerous celebrated Dharma-Nibandhas of Kamalākarabhaṭṭa and Nīlakaṇṭhabhaṭṭa appears to be referred to explicitly anywhere in the *Srāddhadīdhiti*.

With a view to give the reader a tolerable idea of the author's style, I furnish below at some length the opening portion of the *Srādhadīdhiti* and its conclusion :

Beginning :

श्रीगणेशाय नमः

सुजानधर्मरत्नेऽस्मिन् श्रद्धया श्राद्धदीधितिः ।
विविच्यते यतः श्राद्धविषया धीर्भवेत्परा ।।

अथ श्राद्धकालस्य, तत्र श्राद्धं नाम पित्रुद्देशेन श्रद्धया त्यक्तस्य द्रव्यस्य ब्राह्मणैः स्वीकारः । तदुक्तं ब्रह्माण्डपुराणे—

देशे काले च पात्रे च श्रद्धया विधिना च यत् ।
पितृनुद्दिश्य विप्रेभ्यो दत्तं श्राद्धमिहोच्यते ।। इति ।।

अत्र 'दत्तम्' इत्यनेन स्वस्वत्वत्यागपूर्वकपरस्वत्वापादानोक्तेर्ब्राह्मणस्वीकारान्त-व्यापारलाभः ।

होमश्च पिण्डदानं च तथा ब्राह्मणभोजनम् ।
श्राद्धशब्दाभिधेयं स्यादेकस्मिन्नौपचारिके ।।

इति वाक्यात्त्रयप्रधानमिति हेमाद्रिः। धर्मप्रदीपे तु विशेष उक्तः —

यजुषां पिण्डदानं स्याद्बह्वृचां द्विजतर्पणम्।
श्राद्धशब्दाभिधेयं स्यादुभयं सामवेदिनाम्॥ इति॥

प्रेतोद्देशेन श्रद्धयान्नस्य तत्स्थानीयस्य वा द्रव्यस्य त्यागः श्राद्धमिति विज्ञानेश्वरः। संबोधनपदोपनीतान् पित्रादींश्चतुर्थ्यन्तेनोद्दिश्य हविस्त्यागः श्राद्धमिति शूलपाणिः। ब्राह्मणस्वीकारान्तः पितॄनुद्दिश्य द्रव्यत्यागः श्राद्धमिति कल्पतरुः। तत्त्रयमप्ययुक्तम्। आद्ययोः पिण्डपितृयज्ञपित्र्येष्टिसोमयागगतपिण्डदानेष्वतिव्याप्तेः। आद्यान्त्ययोर्भारतादिप्रसिद्धपित्राद्युद्देश्यकहिरण्यादिदानेष्वतिव्याप्तेः, संन्यासाद्यङ्गभूतदैवार्षश्राद्धेष्वव्याप्तेश्च। एतेन मृतोद्देश्यको विप्रस्वीकाराङ्गको द्रव्यत्यागः श्राद्धं, जीवच्छ्राद्धे दैवश्राद्धे च श्राद्धपदं गौणं कौण्डपाय्यग्निहोत्रपदवदिति यदुक्तं केनचित्तन्निरस्तम्। उक्तदोषात्। जीवच्छ्राद्धादौ च तच्छब्दप्रयोगस्य गौणत्वे मानाभावात्। वक्ष्यमाणरीत्या तत्रापि तस्य मुख्यत्वोपपत्तेश्च। वस्तुतोऽनतिप्रसक्तं मन्त्रत्ववच्छ्राद्धप्रसिद्धिविषयत्वमेव श्राद्धत्वं सर्वानुगतमन्यानिरूपणात्॥ etc.,

End :

योऽसौ सर्वनृपोत्तमः क्षितितले यस्याभिधासंश्रवात्
सद्यः शत्रुकुलं प्रयाति सबलं द्वीपान्तरं सत्वरम्।
यो दानैः सकलान्द्विजान्समतनोत्यर्थैः समृद्धान्सदा
तस्य श्रीशसुजानसिंहसुमतेराज्ञावशान्निर्मिते॥
सुजानधर्मरत्नाख्ये ग्रन्थेऽस्मिन् श्राद्धदीधितिः।
भैयाभट्टेन विदुषा यथामति विवेचितः॥

Colophon :

इति श्रीमहाराजाधिराजसुजानसिंहादेशान्निर्मिते सुजानधर्मरत्ने भट्टभट्टारकभट्टप्रभाकरसूरिसूनुना कृष्णभट्टापराभिधेन भैयाभट्टेन प्रकाशितः श्राद्धदीधितः सम्पूर्णः॥

The author's identity as well as his date, which does not appear to be noted by him explicitly anywhere in the above-mentioned three dīdhitis, can be settled with utmost precision in the light of external and internal evidences. The *Kālatattva* which is cited numerously is at some places referred to by the author as a work of his own uncle. Vide, for instance: "......... पितृव्यचरणास्तु कालतत्त्वे आहुः —कृष्णपक्षप्रयुक्तश्राद्धं सकृदेव, वसन्तप्रयुक्त इव ज्योतिष्टोमः। सकृत्कृते कृतः शास्त्रार्थ इति न्यायात्। etc." — Folio 4[a], "पितृव्यचरणास्तु कालतत्त्वे . . . . . . इत्याहुः।" — Folio 16[ab], "कालतत्त्वे पितृव्यचरणास्तु etc." — Folio 112[a].:

This shows that our author was a scion of the celebrated Bhaṭṭa family of Benares, his said uncle being identical with *Samrāṭsthapati* Raghunāthabhaṭṭa who composed his *Kālatattvavivecana* in 1620 A.C.,[9] *Triṁśacchlokīṭīkā* in 1588 A. C.[10] and *Daśaślokīṭīkā* in 1578 A. C.[11] and his father being identical with Prabhākarabhaṭṭa who was born in 1564 A. C.[12] and, among many very learned works, composed the *Rasapradīpa* in 1583 A. C.[13] Kantanātha Bhaṭṭa,[14] author of the *Bhaṭṭavaṁśakāvya*, and Narayana Sastri Khiste,[15] editor of the *editio princeps* of the *Rasapradīpa*, are aware of Kṛṣṇabhaṭṭa's being the son of Prabhākarabhaṭṭa and author of a hymn entitled

---

[9] Vide the concluding verse 2 of the *Kālatattvavivecana*—सप्तसप्तरसभूमिमितेऽब्दे कार्त्तिकासितमुनौ रविवारे। ग्रन्थपूर्तिसुकृतं रघुनाथो राघवाय परमर्पयतिस्म ॥ (—Folio 368b of MS Accession No 3444 of the MSS Library of the *Scindia Oriental Institute*). The date (1677) recorded here pertains to Vikrama Saṁvat.

[10] Vide my paper 'Exact Date of Raghunāthabhaṭṭa's Commentary on the *Triṁśacchlokī*' published in the *Poona Orientalist* (Vol. XI, pp. 43-44).

[11] P. V. Kaṇe: *HD.*, I, pp. 516b, 726b.

[12] Hall: *Index to the Bibliography of the Indian Philosophical Systems* (Calcutta, 1859), p. 141, and others. The date of birth was arrived at on the strength of Prabhākarabhaṭṭa's statement (vide next footnote) that he composed the *Rasapradipa* in Saṁvat 1640 when he was 19 years of age.

[13] Vide the following verse at the conclusion of the *Rasapradīpa*

—व्योमाकूपारभूमीश १६४० गणिते खरवत्सरे। एकोनविंशवर्षेण प्रबन्धोऽयं कृतो मया ॥

[14] He hailed from this very Bhaṭṭa family of Banaras and published his *Bhaṭṭavaṁśakāvya,* a ten-canto epic, from Mirzapore (U. P.) in 1903. The details concerning Kṛṣṇabhaṭṭa are furnished in the following lines (III. 33–34) of the epic—

तत्पुत्रोऽप्यथ कृष्णभट्टसुमतिर्वागीश्वरीं चिन्तयन् ग्रन्थं स्वस्थिरवंशरूपमकरोद्वागीश्वरीसंस्तवम् ॥ सत्ये द्रव्ये राजनीतौ कलायां धैर्ये बुद्धौ तापने निम्नतायाम्। धर्मः श्रीदो भार्गवोऽब्जोऽद्रिराजो धीशः सूर्यः सागरः कृष्णभट्टः ॥

Kantanatha Bhaṭṭa appears to suggest that Kṛṣṇabhaṭṭa had no son and with him Prabhākarabhaṭṭa's line was broken in direct descent.

[15] Vide his Introduction to the edition, p. 9.

Vāgīśvarīsaṁstava,[16] but both of them appear to be ignorant of the facts that 'Bhaiyābhaṭṭa' was identical with Kṛṣṇabhaṭṭa and that the gigantic Dharma-Nibandha *Sujānadharmaratna*, definitely a far more important work than the *Vāgīśvarīsaṁstava*, was his own composition.

The *Sujānadharmaratna* derives its title from a ruler named Sujānasiṁha at whose instigation Bhaiyābhaṭṭa set to its composition. The royal patron is described as a scion of the Bundela line and as son of Pahārasiṁha, grandson of Vīrasiṁha and great-grandson of Madhukara. In the light of the author's identity fixed above, this Sujānasiṁha appears to be verily identical with the Bundela King Sujān Singh of Orchha who ruled between 1653 and 1672 A. C. and was a son of Pahār Singh (1641—1653), a grandson of the renowned Bīr Singh Deo (1605—1627) and a great-grandson of Madhukar Sāh (1554—1592).[17] As Sujānasiṁha is mentioned as a living ruler by the author, the *Sujānadharmaratna* must have been composed some time between 1653 and 1672 A. C., and, we would probably not be far from the truth if we assign it to *c*. 1660 A. C.

After thus establishing our author's age and identity, we may with a fair degree of certainty identify him with Bhaiyābhaṭṭa, who, as an important contemporary admirer, has contributed ten verses[18] in two instalments to the *Kavīndracandrodaya* in eulogy of the celebrated Kavīndrācārya (*c*. 1650 A. C.). We may also further identify him with Bhaiyābhaṭṭa who is the 26th signatory to a

---

[16] No MS of this *Vagīśvarīsaṁstava* is recorded in Aufrecht's *CC.*

[17] Vide *Imperial Gazetteer of India—Central India* (Calcutta, 1908), pp. 349-350, etc.

[18] Vide verses 61-62 and 273-280 of the *Kavīndracandrodaya* (Poona, 1939) edited by H. D. Sharma and M. M. Patkar. The editor's Introduction (p. vi) states that Bhaiyābhaṭṭa is quoted in the *Sūktisundara*, an anthology by Sundaradeva, represented by MS No. 1237 of H. D. Velankar's *BBRAS Sanskrit MSS Catalogue*.

Banaras Nirṇayapatra[19] dated Śaka 1579 or 1657 A. C. granting approval for the genuineness and purity of the Devarṣi (i.e. Devarukhe) Brāhmaṇa community of Mahārāṣṭra. Among the seventy learned signatories that have attested this important socio-religious document are eminent contemporary authors and personages like Nīlakaṇṭhabhaṭṭ, Gāgābhaṭṭa, Khaṇḍadeva, Mahādeva Bhāradvāja, etc.

Evidently, our author Kṛṣṇabhaṭṭa *alias* Bhaiyābhaṭṭa was a conspicuous figure in the contemporary Paṇḍita society of Banaras. Hailing from a line of exceptionally learned and brilliant authors, he with his Śāstric acquisitions easily became recipient of rich royal patronage from the pre-eminent Bundela throne of Orchha[20] which he certainly deserved as his *Sujānadharmaratna* amply testifies. Still, it has to be conceded, he does not reach the supreme level of other eminent Bhaṭṭas and falls lower in comparison with them.[21] It is probably only thus that we can explain why Kamalākarabhaṭṭa's *Nirṇayasindhu* or Nīlakaṇṭhabhaṭṭā's Mayūkhas, composed under the royal patronage only of a trivial Bundela chief belonging to an insignificant throne, viz. Bhagavantadeva of Bhareha, have not only survived but flourished through these centuries while Bhaiyābhaṭṭa's *Sujānadharmaratna*, despite the superior royal patronage endowed on it, has fallen into sheer oblivion. Today even the best-informed Paṇḍitas of Banaras and the members

---

19 R. S. Pimputkar: *Citaḷebhaṭṭa-Prakaraṇa* (Bombay, 1926), Appendix 2, pp. 78—81. P. K. Gode has reproduced this Nirṇayapatra as an Appendix to his paper 'Some New Evidence regarding Devabhaṭṭa Mahāśabde' published in *Poona Orientalist,* Vol. VIII, pp. 129-138.

20 Numerous Sanskrit works have been composed under the royal patronage of the Bundela princes of Orchha, Mitra-miśra's encyclopaedic Dharma Nibandha *Vīramitrodaya* being among them.

21 Even his eulogistic verses do no fair justice to his heritage from the family of the Bhaṭṭas many of whom were also great poets and rhetoricians.

of the Bhaṭṭa family, I find, have no knowledge whatsoever of Bhaiyābhaṭṭa or of his *Sujānadharmaratna*! Anyhow, it is hoped successful attempts would now be made by interested investigators to trace out MSS of the remaining dīdhitis of the *Sujānadharmaratna* and of other works, if any, by our author.

I have no means to decide if Kṛṣṇabhaṭṭa, the author of the *Cāturmāsyaprayoga* (Baudhāyanīya) recorded by Aufrecht at *CC*, I, P. 116ᵇ, is or is not identical with our Kṛṣṇabhaṭṭa *alias* Bhaiyābhaṭṭa.

SANSKRIT THROUGH THE AGES*

By SHRI K. M. MUNSHI

I

OF all the forces which bind the man and make him a social and cultural being, the most powerful is the 'Word.' In that sense, the worship of the Word, Śabda-Brahma, is one of the most all-pervading forces of life. For instance, geographically India owes everything to the Himalayas; in the sphere of social relationships, the mind and the spirit, India owes everything to Sanskrit.

In proto-historic times, the early Aryans forged the Aryan language, the ancestor of many Indo-European languages. In so forging, certain ideas came to be compressed in words of fateful meaning; in the progress of time these words moulded the social, intellectual and spiritual life of the human race. In India, the Aryans invested the Word in the primary Prakrit they spoke, and which later became classical Sanskrit with extraordinary sanctity. This happened long before the *Daśarajña*, the Battle of ten Kings, the great historical event recorded in the *Ṛgveda*. The Aryan tribes fought each other and fought against the non-Aryan Dasyus; but they were bound together by the spoken word. When the words came out in rhythmic chants in hymns they were mantras, divinities themselves. Those who would compose the mantras were demi-gods, worship-worthy. It was this belief that the perfect word was a divinity, that the man who commanded it was half divine that made Sanskrit in its infancy a living binding force of minds and tribes. The Aryan spoke Sanskrit; whoever came to speak that language was the elect; and that culture could be acquired only through it.

---

* The Annual Address delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Institute.

This idea has been at the root of all that followed in India's varied life. *Ṛgvedic* mantras were stylised lyrical poems intended to invest rituals with greater efficacy; but from the mantras earliest in time to the latest Tenth Maṇḍala, there is clear indication that the language was not far remote from the spoken language undergoing progressive change by use. But it was the mantras which kept the race together. The *Atharvaveda*, though in substance not less old than the *Ṛgveda*, was in form a later composition at a time when the spoken language was not very different from the time of the grammarian Patañjali; but the hymns when canonised were given the archaic garb of the mantra. The Brāhmaṇas again are described as the only genuine prose works which Sanskrit as a popular language can produce. Upaniṣads also were the vehicle of living thought in the dialect of the teachers and the pupil.

During the centuries which elapsed between the emergence of a dominant Aryan power in the Sapta Sindhu and the battle of the *Mahābhārata* in 1500 B.C., the primary Prākṛt evolved to very near classical Sanskrit as the spoken language of the people. It was recognised as the great unifying force, for the central idea of Aryan culture was *Ṛta*—the over-arching law of life; and Sanskrit was *Ṛta* in action unifying, uplifting and bringing one nearer to the gods.

II

From the Bhārata War to the rise of the Magadha (1500 B. C. to 700 B. C.) when authentic history begins, this idea took hold of the sub-conscious of the race, Sanskrit was not merely a living language of power in daily use among the people living in the valleys of the Sindhu and the Gaṅgā and their tributaries. It was more. It was the language of literature, philosophy, and law, which the gods spoke and through which gods will hearken. It was

best spoken in the Madhya-Deśa where the sacred Brāhmaṇas lived and taught; it was studied, spoken and taught in the hermitages which had been progressively pushing forward the frontiers of Āryāvarta towards the east and the south. Wherever Sanskrit was spoken and taught, there was Āryāvarta.

III

Ṛgvedic mantras had become the divine Word, divinities with mystic power to be worshipped by their sound and accent alone; the rock of the ages to which all life was to turn for inspiration and concentrated symbol and embodiment of the spirit of all life. Ritualistic literature was sacrosanct. *Mahābhārata* was growing into a wide literature of life: epic heroism; legends of kings and ṛṣis, sacred rivers and holy places; wise lessons in practical wisdom and philosophic and moral speculations resulting from man's efforts to attain the Divine. The whole subconscious of the race was made articulate and gathered. The ākhyānas were composed by poets and narrators for popular audiences of the time; some of the legends were taken from current folk stories. For many centuries after they were composed, they were recited in courts and halls and gatherings of men to inspire or to point a moral.

The Dharmasūtra literature and the *Manusmṛti*, the oldest law text, were for the use of the people who spoke the language. The Upaniṣads and the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, the original of which was composed long before the seventh century B. C. embodied the intellectual speculations of the day. During these 800 and odd years Sanskrit evolved vigorously not only as the spoken and literary language of a vast educated public and the vehicle of higher intellectual, aesthetic and scientific expression but also as the visual embodiment as well as the instrument of Aryan culture

which was spreading far and wide uplifting and organising all races.

IV

During the age of Imperial Magadha from 700 B. C. to 150 B. C. no doubt the people in different parts of the North spoke the Prākṛts; in the South they spoke their own dialects. Even cononical texts like those of Buddhism and Jainism and folk stories which provided entertainment were composed in the Prākṛts. But they were just popular dialects; Sanskrit was the language of polished expression; and their mutual reaction enriched Sanskrit and gave form and range to the Prākrts. But Sanskrit was accepted as the language of divine power. Wherever it was learnt men rose in the scale of culture, and Āryāvarta was born.

Between 150 B. C. and 320 A. D. India saw the rise of alien kingdom in the North-West and Western India and a powerful political and religious movement born in the Central and Southern India, which overthrew foreign rule and re-established Dharma. Sanskrit was the inspiration, the symbol and the vehicle of this national resurgence. The Śātavāhanas and the Nāgas, the spearhead of this resistance movement, possibly made it the language of official intercourse; for inscriptions begin to be composed in Sanskrit from about the second century. The same movement gave vigour and influence to Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism—the teachers of which at the highest level accepted Sanskrit as the language of the gods.

By this time *Ṛta* had become the Dharma—law of life and Sanskrit was Dharma in action. All higher intellecttual and moral life was developed and expressed through Sanskrit.

Buddha and Mahāvīra could preach in Prākrt in the sixth century B. C.; in the early centuries of the Christian

era, Mahāyāna Buddhists resorted to Sanskrit for their religious and philosophical works, and in the sixth century Siddhasena Divakara had to invest Jain teachings with the dignity of Sanskrit.

V

During the golden prime of the Guptas Sanskrit became the mighty force which permeated the collective subconscious of the race and integrated it in the light of the fundamental values of the culture it stood for not only in the North but even among the enlightened settlements of the South. In scope, form and quality literary expression reached its high water mark during this period. It saw the works of Kālidāsa, the final edition of *Mahābhārata*, the scripture of hundred thousand verses; *Rāmāyaṇa* was accepted as the poem of perfect form and beauty. Under the rule of the Gupta emperors who were munificent patrons of literature and religion, Sanskrit grew in vigour as the embodiment, vehicle and instrument of a powerful all-pervading culture which went by the name of Sanātana Dharma. The homes of Sanskritic learning multiplied. Royal dynasties vied with each other in patronising Sanskritic poets and scholars. The dignity and graces of life came to be associated with it. Even the imagination and idioms of the illiterate and the vulgar in distant parts were filled with its richness.

In North India it was the language of culture and learning, of polished life and respectability. Education was overwhelmingly in Sanskrit. In the South, it was the language of cultural inspiration and provided literary form and substance to early Kannaḍa, Telugu and Malayalam. Sanskrit was very largely spoken in the country. Śakuntalā's effortless beauty and Śāntiparva's wisdom were composed by men who sang and spoke in a living medium of power for

the benefit of a large public who were moved or inspired directly by it.

Sanskrit during this period was the goddess of learning—Sarasvatī, Bhāratī. Wherever it was worshipped a new creative power was born; peoples of different origin and dialects were welded together by a common consciousness of selfsame images, ideas and values. The Dharmacakra rolled on; but the wheel was principally cast in Sanskrit; whoever taught or studied Sanskrit added to its speed.

VI

From about 550 A.D. when the Gupta Empire fell to 950 A.D. when the Empire of the Pratihāras was dissolved North India was dominated by Kanauj, the imperial capital. The striking features of that age which changed the face of the Indian history were the emergence of a North Indian Empire mainly controlled by North-Western India; the emergence of the South as a powerful factor in all-India politics and the segregation of the three main castes from each other. The powerful ruling houses drew their descent and following from uncultured races, from outside the belt where Sanskrit was the spoken language. Varṇāśrama-Dharma as originally understood was broken. Brāhamaṇas, Kṣatriyas and the Vaiśyas were no longer indissoluble parts of one whole studying together and sharing the knowledge and reverence for Sanskrit and subject to the ban of *pratiloma*, intermarrying freely. Brāhmaṇas with the importance attained during Gupta times, became the aristocrats of high learning; Sanskrit equally became the language of high-browed culture. At a lower level Prākṛts and Apabhraṁśa were the languages of popular literature; and undeveloped dialects formed the media of intercourse among the common people; and they all assumed greater importance. But Sanskrit dominated the whole country. According to Rājaśekhara's *Kāvyamīmāṁsā*, it was spoken all over the country:

but in Lata (Gujarat) they hated it; in Marwaḍ, Rajputana and Saurashtra they mixed it with Apabhraṁśa; in Madhyadesa and in Gauḍa it was the language of the educated men. Sanskrit literature in consequence, acquired an aristocratic and learned character written by the learned for the learned. The poets underwent an elaborate course of training, mastered several branches of learning including the drama, poetics and lexicography and rigidly followed srict rules. Naturally their works were not intended for popular audiences and lost the inspiration of direct experience. Of the age which began with Subandhu at the end of the sixth century, Bāṇa was the great prototype and model. The living literature found expression in Prākṛt and Apabhraṁśa but never did it escape the influence of Sanskrit. Sanskrit thus became the language of gods attainable by a life-long devotion. As its sphere of use contracted, its importance as the ultimate source of all influence increased. It was indispensable to everyone who claimed to a respected place in life. Even when Mohammad Ghazni broke the spell of centuries, destroyed one kingdom after another, throughout the land life was governed by Smṛti texts; *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa* were the texture of men's minds; poets and scholars pursued literary and grammatical acrobatics. Polymaths like Bhojadeva and Hemacandra wrote vast encyclopaedic treatises in Sanskrit and allied languages. Innumerable universities and *pāṭhaśālās* in different parts of the country conducted the study of Sanskrit as a spoken language. All learned inercourse was in it; and the royal courts resounded with the learned discourses of eminent scholars in Sanskrit.

VII

With Alla-ud-din Khilji Sanskrit entered a new stage. He destroyed many of the universities in North India. Wherever there was Muslim rule Sanskrit was deprived of

patronage. Men of learning to whom Sanskrit was the breath of life fled to distant villages, where in their homes or little *pāṭhaśalās* they kept alive the torch of their beloved learning. To the whole group of people, misery laiden, flying before unsatiated vandals, Sanskrit remained the light, the strength, the hope of glorious future, the pathway to salvation, something more than life itself.

Learned men threw themselves on the generosity of the ordinary public, ignorant of Sanskrit, and took to popular literatures in the derivative languages. This led to the great Renaissance beginning with the 15th century of which the Bhakti and the Sant schools were the outstanding products. Spiritual and moral resurgence found expression through a study and adaptation of the *Mahabharata*, *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Bhagavata* and *Gītagovinda*. In Hindu States, the patronage of Sanskrit scholars became a primary duty. Though the general public progressively lost direct touch with Sanskrit, every small town or a big village maintained a *pāṭhaśālā* and revered its students. In North India Vrajabhāṣā was par excellence the medium through which Sanskrit spread all over the country its influence in literature.

VIII

The next period began with the beginning of the 19th century. Sanskrit, as a spoken language, was confined to the *pāṭhaśālās* and its products; to maintain the *paṭhasalas* was the pride of every enlightened locality; and vast numbers of Brāhmanas were required as priests, astrologers, panditas or pauraṇikas and Śāstras which they produced kept the influence of Sanskrit alive, though their quality ranged from the encyclopedic pandit who could quote every Śāstra down to the village priest who could only mumble mutilated verses at the marriage or funeral ceremony. Even those who did not study Sanskrit were familiar in their own languages with the numerous adaptations of great

Sanskrit works. Sanskrit thus provided a vast agency for maintaining the bond throughout the land.

When the Moghul empire faded away the vestige of a shadowy political bond disappeared. What was left was the unity provided by the culture which was derived from and dependent on Sanskrit. Enlightened officials of the East India Company were fascinated by Sanskrit at a very early stage. They tried to preserve the great *pāṭhaśālās*. They collected Sanskrit manuscripts, edited and published them; and when the universities were founded in the middle of the 19th century, they made Sanskrit the predominant second language in the country.

The Indian Universities were the birth-place of the powerful Sanskritic revival which in association with Western culture led to the modern Indian renaissance; to the growth and enrichment of all our spoken languages and the development of a national language—Hindi. Sanskrit has been the language of gods; for it has brought us their gifts.

IX

Indian unity during the last century was based upon the British arms and by the conscious unity created by the Sanskritic culture. British arms disappeared—Partition followed between two groups of men whose sub-conscious mind drew inspiration from two distinct sources. Today in India, the collective sub-conscious of the people is represented by what Sanskrit stands for; their greatest conscious unity lies in a way of life dominated by Sanskrit culture. Today Sanskrit is religiously studied in a vast majority of its Universities, colleges and high schools. In not less than 10,000 *pāṭhaśālās*, men devoted to a lifelong study of Sanskrit, use it as a living medium. Possibly, more than 25,000 people in the country speak it with fluency. Over 500,000 men follow the priestly vocation and bring God nearer to man through the aid of Sanskrit whatever they can use.

The life of about two hundred million people, on the occasion of a birth, marriage or death or in prayer or ritual, echoes to the sweet accents of sacred recitals in Sanskrit. The episodes, characters, imageries and idioms of the *Mahābhārata*, *Rāmāyaṇa*, and *Bhāgavata*, have been woven inextricably into the texture of people's lives. The Indian languages spoken by over 350 millions have been and are being enriched by Sanskrit vocabulary.

India could attain her solidarity and cultural vitality through Sanskrit and could only retain them through it. With but rare exceptions, the great and the noble in all generations in our land, who influenced life as a whole, have found self-fulfilment with the aid of Sanskrit and what it stands for. In the recent past, India, though a subject race, regained her lost prestige through scholars whose vision had mainly been enriched by Sanskritic studies. The Universities of most civilised nations find in them both interest and inspiration. Sanskrit and the closely allied Pali form the great cultural link which binds South-East Asia, China and Japan. Professor Norman Brown, now the Director of the Department of South-East Asian studies of the Pensylvania University told me last year that students preparing to go to South-East Asia discover that they cannot understand its true spirit without a study of Sanskrit. Urdu, the official language of Pakistan, in spite of its Perso-Arabic vocabulary, is an Indo-Aryan language, and so is Pushtu, the language of Afghanistan. Persian is allied to Sanskrit. The thread of Indo-Aryan unity runs through Latin and Greek and the languages derived from them. And a true appreciation of the aspirations of the *Upaniṣads*, the epic strength of the *Mahābhārata*, the grandeur of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the beauty of Kālidāsa and the *Bhāgavata*, and the inspiration of the *Dhammapada* and the *Bhagavad-Gītā* only would help our race to go forward on the path of inner strength.

X.

Sanskrit, thus being the natural basis of our unity, culture and vitality, its future deserves a careful consideration.

First, the highly placed persons in this country, who have studied Sanskrit and believe in it as an integral element of our national life, are unorganised in their efforts to maintain Sanskirt in its pre-eminent position.

Secondly, in our Universities, and in the higher educational systems, there is a growing outlook borrowed largely from the West, that the study of a classical language is a superfluity, an outook based on ignorance, for, to India, Sanskrit is not a classical language which serves but to add to the accomplishment of an educated man, it is a vital link in the nation's evolution.

Thirdly, the elimination of the princely order which, in spite of its many faults, gave generous patronage to the *pāṭhaśālās*, the centres of traditional Sanskrit learning which so far kept the language alive as a spoken language, and the decay of religious belief which denies to their products the means of livelihood.

Lastly, the outlook, fashionable in some westernised sections of the people, that a faith in Sanskrit as a vitalising force in the modern world is a sign of revivalism. Their children no longer learn the Epics, which have made and preserved India, from the mother's lips. Nothing could be more saddening than the fact that over sixty per cent of candidates for the I. A. S., the prospective rulers of India, did not know of Kuntī, the noble mother, or of Karṇa, the soul of honour and generosity.

With the dawn of freedom and with the acceptance of Hindi, principally drawn from Sanskrit, as the national language, one would have thought that the encouragement to the study of Sanskrit would have been accepted as one of the first responsibilities of our Governments. Some

Governments like that of the Uttar Pradesh have done so. Others, however, have lacked the time or inclination to do so. But it is only a question of time. The basic importance of Sanskrit which underlies our lives, has had no opportunity to express itself fully through the governing class which the struggle for freedom threw up. To any one, who does not bring to bear a superficial outlook, it would be clear that our freedom would have no meaning if India lost her soul; that we would have no future if she abandoned the principal source of her strength. I go one step further; the world could only be redeemed by a wider appreciation of what Sanskrit stands for; the efficacy of non-violence and Truth, Non-waste, Non-stealing and Non-possession, and faith in the integration of human personality, in the supremacy of the moral order and in the divine essence in man.

The only way to vitalise the study of Sanskrit not merely as a matter of learning or research, but as a cultural force of universal value is to draw upon all the energy and resources which, at present, are being spent in promoting Sanskrit in diverse ways. At the same time, the general interest and widespread support for Sanskrit should not, by being too regulated or centralised, lose the element of spontaneity. The movement should, therefore, be vitalising and not controlling or regulating.

At the same time, persons interested in Sanskrit should study the condition of Sanskritic studies each in his own sphere from the following points of view :

(i) the place occupied by Sanskrit in our Universities and systems of higher education;

(ii) the assistance given by the Central and the State Governments to Sanskritic studies;

(iii) the recognition of Sāstric titles as qualifying for University degrees;

(iv) the position of *Pāṭhaśālās*, their economic condition and the way of providing economic assistance to them and career possibilities to their students;

(v) the position of Sanskritic research;

(vi) the desirability of having easy examination programmes for those anxious to study Sanskrit privately;

(vii) the desirability of holding conferences of those interested in Sanskrit;

(viii) the ways and means to make Sanskrit literature and particularly the Epics an element in mass education.

Our appeal must necessarily be in the first instance to the educationists, the professors, the school-masters, the lawyers, the men of literature and education, a vast majority of whom are interested in Sanskrit in one way or another. It is for them to develop a conscious response to this movement. In the Universities and the colleges, particularly, groups of educationists, teachers and students could be found who can easily form themselves into centres of study. Naturally every *pāṭhaśālā* is a centre of Sanskrit. On the Ministers, Vice-Chancellors and high officials who have interset in Sanskrit, lies a great responsibility; and if each one of them acts effectively in his own sphere, we can still preserve the vital strength which Sanskrit has given us through the ages.

THE GAṆEŚA-PURĀṆA.

By R. C. Hazra

Though not mentioned in any of the lists of Purāṇas and Upapurāṇas, this work[1] reckons itself as one of the

---

[1] Our analysis of this Upa-purāṇa is based on the edition published by Gopal Narayan and Co., Bombay, 1892.

According to M. Winternitz, an edition of the *Gaṇeśa-purāṇa* 'appeared in Poona in 1876.' (See Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature*, I, p. 582, footnote 3). As I was unable to procure a copy of this Poona edition, I could not compare it with the Bombay edition.

For MSS of this *Gaṇeśa-purāṇa* (hereinafter referred to as *Gaṇeśa-p.* or *Gan.*) see:

(i) Aufrecht, *Bodleian Catalogue of Sans.* MSS, pp. 78-79, Nos. 133-134. (Of these two MSS, the former contains the Upāsanā-khaṇḍa divided into 93 chapters).

(ii) Eggeling, *India Office Catalogue of Sans. MSS*, VI, p. 1199, Nos. 3349-51. (Of these three MSS, the first preserves the text of the Upāsanā-khaṇḍa of 93 chapters).

(iii) R. L. Mitra, *Notices of Sans. MSS*, VII, pp. 91-96, Nos. 2325-26. (Of these two MSS, the former is incomplete and contains chaps. 1—81 of the Upāsanā-khaṇḍa).

(iv) Hrishikesh Shastri and Siva Chandra Gui, *Calcutta Sans. College Catalogue*, IV, pp. 18-19, No. 23 (containing both the Khaṇḍas).

(v) A. C. Burnell, *Classified Index to the Sans. MSS in the Palace at Tanjore*, p. 187.

(vi) M. A. Stein, *Jammu Catalogue of Sans. MSS*, p. 200.

(vii) *Benares Sans. College Catalogue of Sans. MSS*, pp. 287 and 308.

(viii) Lewis Rice, *Catalogue of Sans. MSS in Mysore and Coorg*, p. 70.

(ix) Hiralal, *Catalogue of Sans. and Prakrit MSS in the Central Province and Berar*, p. 115.

(x) P. P. S. Sastri, *Tanjore Catalogue of Sans. MSS*, XV, pp. 7171-72, No. 10571—77.

(xi) H. I. Poleman, *Census of Indic MSS in the United States and Canada*, p. 49, Nos. 1046—48.

(xii) *Adyar Library Catalogue of Sans. MSS*, Part I, p. 150.

'eighteen Upa-purāṇas'[2] but does not claim to belong to any Mahā-purāṇa. It is divided into two parts, viz, Upāsanā-khaṇḍa and Krīḍā-khaṇḍa, of which the former consists of 92 chapters and the latter (styled 'Uttara-khaṇḍa' in all the chapter-colophons), of 155 chapters.

At the very outset of the first part we are told that some sages, who attended the twelve-year sacrifice instituted by Śaunaka and had already heard the 'eighteen Purāṇas', requested Sūta to speak further on Purāṇic topics. Con-

---

(xiii) F. Kielhorn, *Report on the Search for Sans. MSS in the Bombay Presidency during the year* 1880-81, p. 64. (The MSS is dated Saṃvat 1890).

For MSS of the *Gaṇeśa-gītā* (forming chaps. 138—148 of the second part of the *Gaṇeśa-p.*), see

(i) Mitra, *Notices of Sans. MSS*, IV, pp. 27-28, No. 1403.

(ii) Haraprasad Shastri, *Catalogue of Sans. MSS in the Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, (hereinafter referred to as *ASB. Cat.*), pp. 789—791, Nos. 4137-38. (The latter MS is dated Śaka 1616 and furnished with a commentary entitled *Gaṇapati-bhāva-dīpikā* of Nīlakaṇṭha, son of Govinda-sūri).

(iii) M. A. Stein, *Jammu Catalogue of Sans. MSS*, p. 200. (One of the two MSS mentioned by Stein contains Nīlakantha's commentary).

(iv) R. G. Bhandarkar, *Report on the Search for Sans. MSS in the Bombay Presidency during the years* 1887-88, 1888-89, 1889-90, *and* 1890-91, p. 11.

For MSS of the *Gaṇeśa-sahasra-nāma-stotra* (occurring in *Gaṇ*, I, 46); see

(i) Mitra, *Notices of Sans. MSS*, IV, p. 32, No. 1410. (This MS is dated Śaka 1549 and furnished with the commentary of Gopālabhaṭṭa, surnamed Ḍāva).

(ii) R. L. Mitra, *Bikaner Catalogue of Sans. MSS*, pp. 199—200, No. 434.

(iii) Chintaharan Chakravarti, *Vangīya Sāhitya Parisat Catalogue of Sans. MSS*, p. 71.

(iv) Aufrecht, *Bodleian Catalogue of Sans. MSS*, p. 79, No. 135.

It should be mentioned that all the above-mentioned MSS are written in Devanāgarī.

[2] *Gaṇ.*, I, 1, 8.

anyāny upa-purāṇāni vartante 'ṣṭādaśaiva ca/
gaṇeśaṁ nāradīyaṁ ca nṛsiṁhādīny athāpi ca//

sequently, Sūta spoke out 'the Purāṇa of Gaṇeśa' and glorified this deity through the story of Somakānta, which runs as follows:

Somakānta, the able and pious ruler of Devanagara (or Devapura) in Saurāṣṭra, had a sudden attack of leprosy. Finding himself completely disabled by this fell disease Somakānta installed his son Hemakaṇṭha on the throne, gave him instructions on *ācāra* and *nīti*,[3] and retired to the forest with his wife Sudharmā and two of his ministers. While living at the side of a lake Sudharmā chanced to meet Cyavana, son of Bhṛgu, and told him all about her husband. Cyavana reported the matter to Bhṛgu, who, consequently, sent Cyavana to bring Somakānta and others to his hermitage. Cyavana did so, and Somakānta asked Bhṛgu the cause of, and remedy for the disease. Bhṛgu explained the whole situation thus. In his previous birth Somakānta was a Vaiśya named Kāmanda of Kolhāranagara near the Vindhya mountain. After his parent's death Kāmanda became reckless and earned much wealth by plundering and killing Brāhmaṇas, women and children. When, in his old age, he became invalid and was forsaken even by his nearest relations, he became repentant and determined to give away all his ill-earned property to worthy Brāhmāṇas. But as none came forward to accept anything from him, he spent the greater part of his wealth in turning a small dilapidated temple of Gaṇeśa into a magnificent one.[4] Not long after this Kāmanda died and was allowed by Yama first to reap the fruit of his pious act. Consequently, he

---

[3] For these instructions see *Gaṇ.* I, 3, in which the following topics have been dealt with—morning duties (including salutation to the spiritual preceptors and to Gaṇanātha, Kamalā-pati, Girijā-pati, Dīnānātha and Girijā); purification of the body; general maxims; duties of a king towards his own subjects as well as towards his neighbours.

[4] Kāmanda is said to have furnished this temple with four *toraṇas,* four *dvāras,* and four *śikharas,* and to have decorated it with various kinds of jewels.—*Gaṇ.* I. 8. 21–24.

was born as Somakānta and enjoyed royal fortune for some time. Now that the time for suffering had come, he was attacked with leprosy. Somakānta listened to Bhṛgu's words, but his mind did not become free from doubt. Consequently, a number of birds appeared on the scene and began to tear away Somakānta's flesh. Being very much afflicted Somakānta sought Bhṛgu's protection, and the latter scared away all the birds with a roar and suggested to Somakānta that he should listen to 'the Purāṇa of Gaṇeśa' for escaping all kinds of miseries. Bhṛgu then sprinkled water on Somakānta by repeating one hundred and eight names of Gaṇeśa, and, as a result, an extremely dark pāpa-puruṣa came out of Somakānta's body and resorted to a dry mango tree at the order of the sage. As Somakānta was eager to listen to 'the Purāṇa of Gaṇeśa', Bhṛgu asked him to bathe at the Bhṛgu-tīrtha and undertake a solemn vow for the purpose. Somakānta did so and instantaneously became free from the disease. Bhṛgu then glorified Gaṇeśa as well as the Purāṇa in his praise, which Bhṛgu had heard from Vyāsa, and Dakṣa from Mudgala. Bhṛgu added that as, during the Kali age, the people did not study the Vedas, neglected the duties enjoined on them by their castes and orders of life, created mixed castes, and committed various kinds of sins, Vyāsa wrote the eighteen Purāṇas and the eighteen Upapurāṇas for saving the (Vedic) *dharma*.[5] Bhṛgu then narrated the Purāṇa to Somakānta thus: Vyāsa divided the originally one Veda into four and undertook to write the Purāṇas

---

[5] *Gaṇ.* I. 9. 37—39a:
vedārtha-jñāna-rahitān vedādhyayana-varjitān/
varṇāśramācāra-śūnyān jāti-saṅkara-kāriṇaḥ//
kalau vilokya tu janān kuṭilān pāpa-kāriṇaḥ/
aṣṭādaśa purāṇāni kṛtavān dharma-guptaye//
tāvanty upapurāṇāni tato'rthān bubudhur janāḥ/

'for elucidating the meanings of the Vedas'.[6] But as out of pride he did not begin with any verse on salutation to, or in praise of, Gaṇeśa, his memory failed him on certain points. Being unable to account for such loss of memory Vyāsa saw Brahmā in Satya-loka and learnt from him that neglect of Gaṇeśa was the real cause of such forgetfulness. (Chaps. 1—10). Vyāsa then wanted to know about Gaṇeśa and his worship. Consequently Brahmā spoke on the following topics :

Praise of Gaṇeśa as the highest deity and Parama Brahma and of Gaṇeśa-mantras, especially the one-syllabled *mantra-rāja* (oṃ). Method and praise of muttering these *mantras* with the performance of bhūtaśuddhi, nyāsa, mudrā etc. in accordance with the directions of the Āgamas (i.e. Tantras). Method and praise of Gaṇeśa-worship and the performance of various *vratas* of Ganapati, viz., Vināyaka-caturthīvrata, Saṅkaṣṭa-caturthī-vrata, Aṅgāraka-caturthī-vrata etc. Praise of offering Dūrvā grass, Śamī-leaves etc. to Gaṇapati. Description of Gaṇeśa in his *saguṇa* and *nirguṇa* aspects. Gaṇeśa's existence as *nāda-brahma*. Origin and praise of (i) the holy places sacred to Gaṇeśa, viz., Siddhakṣetra, Gaṇeśapura, Mayūreśvara etc; (ii) the image of Gaṇeśa called Cintāmaṇi at Kadambapura (also called Cintāmaṇipura or Cintāmaṇi-kṣetra) in Vidarbha; (iii) the Gaṇeśa-kuṇḍa at Kadambapura; (iv) the image of Gaṇeśa called Varada at Puṣpakapura; and so on.

In connection with these topics many myths and legends have been introduced in this Purāṇa. Some of these are the following :

Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Maheśa's search for the Supreme Being after *pralaya*; Gaṇeśa's consequent appearance before

---

[6] *Gaṇ*. I. 10. 2—
kṛtvā vedaṃ caturbhāgaṃ tad-artha-jñāna-siddhaye/
sa vidyā-mada-garveṇa purāṇaṃ kartum ārabhat//

these gods by assuming a visible form;[7] and Brahmā, Viṣṇu Maheśa's eulogy of Gaṇeśa by applying to him all the attributes of Parama Brahma. Gaṇeśa's allotment of duties to Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva (of whom the first was entrusted with the Vedas and the Purāṇas, and the last with the one-syllabled and six-syllabled *mantras* of Gaṇeśa as well as with the Āgamas). Brahmā's experience after entering Gaṇeśa's body, his muttering of the one-syllabled *mantra* which Gaṇeśa himself had instructed to Brahmā in a dream by assuming the form of a child lying on a leaf of a banyan tree, and his creation of the universe through Gaṇeśa's favour. Viṣṇu's killing of Madhu and Kaiṭabha after pleasing Gaṇeśa by duly repeating his six-syllabled *mantra*. Mental depression of king Bhīma of Kauṇḍinyanagara in Vidarbha for his childlessness; his approach to Viśvāmitra for remedy; his worship of Gaṇeśa by repeating the one-syllabled *mantra* : and the consequent birth of a son who was named Rukmāṅgada. Attainment of the royal fortune and construction of a Gaṇeśa-temple at Kauṇḍinyanagara by Dakṣa (son of Vallabha, king of Bhānunagara in Karṇāṭa), who, after being discarded by his father for his inborn physical defects, regained his natural form by coming in contact with the air approaching from the body of a Gaṇeśa—worshipping saint named Mudgala and was able to win Gaṇeśa's favour by worshipping him first with the eight-syllabled *mantra* and then with the one-syllabled one in accordance with Mudgala's instructions. Constant worship of Gaṇeśa by Vallāla (son of a Vaiśya named Kalyāṇa of Pallī in Sindhudeśa), as a result of whose curse Kalyāṇa was reborn as Dakṣa mentioned above. Indra's worship of Gaṇeśa with the six-syllabled *mantra*, and his consequent immunity from Gautma's curse which was enjoined on him for enjoying Ahalyā's person during Gautama's absence. Rukmāṅgada's

---

[7] For description of this form see *Gaṇ*. I. 12. 33—38.

bath and Gaṇeśa-worship at Cintāmaṇi-kṣetra in accordance with Nārada's instructions, and his consequent recovery from leprosy caused to him by the curse of Mukundā (the wife of a sage) who was offended with Rukmāṅgada because the latter did not enjoy her person in spite of repeated request. Indra's assumption of the form of Rukmāṅgada and union with Mukundā, and the consequent birth of Gṛtsamada,[8] whom other sages did not recognise as a Brāhmaṇa and who, therefore, cursed his mother to turn into a Badarī (jujube) tree and attained Brāhmaṇattva by practising severe penance and worshipping Gaṇeśa with the Ṛgvedic *mantra* 'gaṇānāṁ tvā etc.' Birth and exploits of Tripura, son of Gṛtsamada, his practice of severe austerities and worship of Gaṇeśa with the *Ṛgvedic* mantra 'gaṇānāṁ tvā etc.,' his receipt of boons as well as of a city called Tripura (also known as Gaṇeśapura) from this deity, and his occupation of heaven and Kailāśa. Śiva's worship of Gaṇeśa with the mention of his one thousand names (Gaṇeśa-sahasra-nāma),[9] and his destruction of the city of Tripura, which was situated in Baṅgāla,[10] by means of a single arrow. Pārvatī's performance of the Vināyaka-caturthī-vrata[11] in accordance with the instructions of Himavat and her consequent marriage with Śiva. King Kardama's living a life of pomp and pleasure and passing to the region of Gaṇeśvara as a result of performing this *vrata* in accordance with Sau-

[8] For complete analysis of the legend of Gṛtsmada see Dr. Stevenson's article in *JRAS*, VIII, pp. 319–329.

[9] For the Gaṇeśa-sanasra-nāma-stotra enunciated by Śiva see *Gaṇ*. I. 46. Many of the names have been arranged alphabetically from अ to क्ष.

[10] *Gaṇ*. I. 39. 6–

tatas tad abhavat sthānaṁ baṅgāle tripurasya ha/
gaṇeśapuraṃ ity evaṁ sarveṣāṁ sarva-siddhidaṃ// See *JGJRI*, Vol. VIII, pt. iv.

[11] For description of this *vrata*, which is to be observed for one month from Śrāvaṇa-śukla-caturthī to Bhādra-śukla-caturthī, see *Gaṇ*. I. 49–51.

bhari's instructions. Nala's attainment of royal fortune by performing the Vināyaka-caturthī-vrata in his previous birth as a Kṣatriya 'in the city of Pippala situated in a land lying beyond Gauḍa-deśa (gauḍa-deśāt pare deśe pure pippala-saṁjñake—*Gaṇ*. I.52.21).

Besides these there are several other stories meant for glorifying the caturthī-vratas of Gaṇeśa, viz., those of queen Indumatī (who rescued her husband Candrāṅgada, king of Mālava, from the Nāga damsels by performing the Gaṇeśa-caturthī-vrata in accordance with Nārada's advice), king Śūrasena of Madhyadeśa (who heard from Indra about the glory of Gaṇeśa and attained the region of this deity by worshipping him duly), a sinning fisherman of Daṇḍakāraṇya (who became known as sage Bhrūśuṇḍi by worshipping Gaṇanātha), the Earth's son Maṅgala by sage Bharadvāja of Avantīnagara, king Kṛtavīrya and his son Kārtavīryārjuna, Sundarā (the daughter of a Kṣatriya named Sāraṅgadhara) of Baṅgālaviṣaya, Rāma Jāmadagnya (who received the six-syllabled Gaṇeśa-mantra from Śiva), the demon Tāraka (whom Skanda[12] was able to kill by duly observing the Vināyaka-caturthī-vrata), and so on.

The second part of the *Gaṇeśa-p.* deals with the exploits of Gaṇeśa (often mentiond as 'Vināyaka') in his different incarnations, and contains the following stories:

Gaṇeśa's birth in the Satya-yuga as Aditi's ten-handed (daśa-bhuja) son named Mahotkaṭa (and Vināyaka) for bringing about the destruction of the demons Narāntaka and Devantaka (who were the sons of a twice-born named Raudraketu of Aṅga and became invincible by worshipping Śiva); his assumption of a two-handed form at the request of his mother; his exploits in his infancy, viz., his killing of (i) Virajā, a Rākṣasī who swallowed him up, (ii) the Rākṣasas Uddhata and Dhundhura who came to kill him by assuming

[12] The story of the birth of Skanda, as given in *Gaṇ*. I. 83ff., has innovations on some points.

the forms of parrots, and (iii) a crocodile which threatened to kill him together with his mother in a lake; his stealing of the images of the five deities (pañcāyatana, viz., Śarvāṇī, Śarva, Viṣṇu, Vināyaka and Ravi) when these were being worshipped by the Gandharvas Hāhā, Hūhū and Tumburu in Kaśyapa's house, his showing of the universe in his mouth in order to dissuade his father from punishing him, and his assumption of the forms of the five deities to the great astonishment of the Gandharvas; his investiture with the sacred thread, during which Brahmā named him Brahmaṇaspati and gave him a lotus, Bṛhaspati named him Bhārabhūti, Kuvera gave him a garland of gems (ratna-mālā) and named him Surānanda, Varuṇa (apām-patiḥ) gave him a noose (pāśa) and named him Sarvapriya, Śaṅkara gave him a trident (triśūla), a *ḍamaru* and a digit of the moon (candrakalā) and name him Virūpākṣa and Bhālacandra, (Jāmadagnya) Rāma's mother gave him an axe (paraśu) and a lion and named him Paraśu-hasta and Siṁha-vāhana, the Sea (sāgara) gave him a garland of pearls and named him Mālādhara, the serpent Śeṣa became his seat and named him Phaṇirājāsana, Fire gave him the power of burning as well as the name 'Dhanañjaya', and so on; Vināyaka's killing of the five Rākṣasas Vighāta, Piṅgākṣa, Viśāla, Piṅgala and Capala who approached him during his *upanayana* by assuming the forms of Brāhmaṇas; his baffling the attempts of Vāyu and Agni, who, being sent by Indra, tried to overpower him; Indra's entrance into Vināyaka's body and viewing in it innumerable universes; Vināyaka's killing of the Rākṣasa Dhūmrākṣa and his sons Jaghana and Manu, when he was being taken to Kāśī by Kāśī-rāja for attending the marriage ceremony of his son; Vināyaka's entrance into Kāśī and killing of numerous demons including Narāntaka and Devāntaka; his worship by Kāśī-rāja; his feasting at every house; his previous appearance as Pārvatī's ten-handed son named Vakra-tuṇḍa, his going to

Benares and killing of the demon Durāsada who had taken his residence at Bhasmakapura (also called Mukundapura) in the land of the Kaivartas,[13] his reputation under the name of Ḍhuṇḍhirāja and residence at Benares by assuming fifty-six different forms, and his re-establishing of Siva at Benares after ousting the pious king Divodāsa with the help of Viṣṇu who assumed the form of a Buddha and misled people by preaching anti-Vedic ideas;[14] and so on. (Chaps. 1-72). Vināyaka's birth in the Tretā-yuga as Pārvatī's son named Mayūreśvara (also called Gaṇeśa and Heramba) for killing the demon Sindhu whose tyranny became unbearable to all; Mayūreśvara's exploits from his childhood, viz., his killing of Gṛdhrāsura, Bālāsura, Vyomāsura, Kamaṭhāsura, and numerous other demons including Sindhu; his showing to his mother and others the universe as lying in his mouth; his riding on the peacock which was born of the egg brought forth by Vinatā; his showing of his viśvarūpa to Brahmā; his destruction of the sacrifice instituted by Indra; his marriage; and so on. (Chaps. 73-126). Vināyaka's birth in the Dvāpara-yuga as Pārvatī's elephant-headed son named Gajānana for bringing about the destruction of the extremely red demon Sindūra born of Brahmā's yawning; Śiva's consolation to Pārvatī who felt very much dejected at the sight of the ugly face of her son; Vāmadeva's curse on a Gandharva named Krauñca, and the latter's consequent birth as a rat; Gajānana's chastisement of this rat and making it his mount (vāhana); his turning red after killing Sindūra; and so on. Besides these, there are stories in praise of (i) the use of Śamī-leaves in Vināyaka-worship, (ii) the construction of images of Vināyaka with

---

[13] *Gaṇ*. II. 39. 16—
kaivartakānāṁ viṣaye nyavasad bhasmake pure/
mukundapuram ity eva khyātaṁ lokeṣu sarvataḥ//

[14] *Gaṇ*. II. 47. 3ff.

Mandāra-wood, (iii) the images of Vināyaka established at different places, and so on. In chaps. 138-148, which constitute the 'Upaniṣad-artha-garbhā Gaṇeśa-gītā,' Gajānana speaks to king Vareṇya on jñāna-yoga, karma-yoga, kṣetra-viveka etc.; in chap. 149 Brahmā gives a description of the evils of the Kali age and says that Vināyaka would manifest himself as Dhūmaketu at the end of this age for exterminating the Mlecchas and re-establishing *dharma*; and in chap. 154 the names of fifty-six Gaṇeśas who attend upon Vināyaka and reside at Benares have been given.

The above contents of the *Gaṇeśa-p.* clearly shows that this work deals exclusively with the praise and worship of Ganeśa (also called Vināyaka, Gajānana, Varada, Vighnanāśa etc.). Although it preaches the unity of all gods,[15] it regards Gaṇeśa as the supreme deity and says that it is only Gaṇeśa who is able to create and avert obstacles and to confer his worshippers *bhakti*, *jñāna* and *mukti*. It looks upon Gaṇeśa from two aspects, *nirguṇa* and *saguṇa*. In his *nirguṇa* aspect Gaṇeśa is the same as Parama Brahma, and all the attributes of the latter are conveniently attached to him. Thus, he is said to be *anādi*, *nitya*, *nirvikāra*, *avyaya*, *aprameya*, *kāraṇātīta*, *kevalānandarūpin* and so on. He is *oṁkāra-rūpin*, *brahma-vidyā-pradāyin* and *vighna-sāgara-śoṣaṇa* and is the original source of the universe (including gods and others). In creation he takes to *guṇas* and appears as Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva and others; and it is Gaṇeśa who manifests himself in different forms for establishing law and order in the world. Thus, the *Gaṇeśa-p.* says, Gaṇeśa incarnated himself as 'tejorūpī,' 'daśa-bhuja' and 'siṁhārūḍha' *Vināyaka* in the Satya-yuga, as 'barhirūḍha,' 'ṣaḍ-bhuja' and 'śaśi-varṇa' *Mayūreśvara* in the

---

[15] See especially *Gaṇ.* II. 138. 20f.—
śive viṣṇau ca śaktau ca sūrye mayi narādhipa/
yo 'bheda-buddhir yogaḥ sa samyag yogo mato mama//
etc.

Tretā-yuga, and as 'rakta-varṇa,' 'ākhu-rūḍha' and 'caturbhuja' *Gajānana* in the Dvāpara, and would appear as 'dhūmra-varṇa', 'nīlāśvārūḍha' and 'dvi-hastavān' *Dhūmaketu* in the Kali-yuga.[16] According to *Gaṇ*. II. 130 Vināyaka was born to Pārvatī in the Dvāpara age with the normal head of a human being, but after being eulogised by his mother he changed his form into that furnished with the head of an elephant. In chap. 134 of its Krīḍā-khaṇḍa the *Gaṇeśa-p*. says that the Gandharva named Krauñca was transformed into a rat by Vāmadeva's curse and that Gajānana overpowered it and made it his vāhana, because it used to eat up the rice kept in earthen pots, damaged books, clothes etc., and created various other troubles in Parāśara's hermitage. Besides the forms of Gaṇeśa mentioned above, the *Gaṇeśa-p*. knows many more, viz., those having two, three, five, eight, twelve or eighteen hands,[17] and two, five or six faces;[18] one of the forms of Gaṇeśa has four tusks[19] and another has a dark complexion (meghābha);[20] Heramba-Gaṇapati has been mentioned in several places; and in *Gaṇ*. I. 46. 137 Gaṇeśa has been described as 'dvi-rūpa'.[21]

Of the different forms of Gaṇeśa mentioned in the *Gaṇeśa-p*., it is the four-handed one which is the most popular. In this form[22] Gaṇapati has a single tusk and a huge serpent coiling round his belly. He wears a crown (mukuṭa), ear-rings (kuṇḍala), armlets (aṅgada), a waist-band (kaṭi-

---

[16] *Gaṇ*. II. 1. 17—21, 78. 41—43, and 130. 28ff.

[17] *Gaṇ*. I. 46. 137—141, and 91. 38—41; and II. 149. 7-8.

[18] *Gaṇ*. I. 46. 137, 141 and 144; I. 44. 26; II. 149. 7.

[19] *Gaṇ*. I. 46. 139.

[20] *Gaṇ*. I. 91. 38.

[21] We do not know whether this 'dvi-rūpa' Gaṇapati is the same as the double-formed Gaṇeśa (called Kangi-ten) whose images are found in Japan. For information about these images see Alice Getty, *Gaṇeśa—A Monograph on the Elephant-faced God,* pp. 78ff. and Plate No. 38.

[22] For description of the four-handed form of Gaṇapati see *Gaṇ*. I. 12. 33—38, 15. 4—6, 20. 31—34, 21. 32—34, 49. 21—23, 66. 17—19, 87. 31—35, 82. 26—29, and 91. 8—9; II. 130. 1—5 and 21—22.

sūtra) generally made of gold (kāñcanīya), and a garland made of pearls (which may be interspersed with gems) or of red flowers. The things, which he carries in hands, are not always the same. Sometimes he bears the 'khaḍga', 'kheṭa', 'dhanus' and 'śakti'; sometimes he holds a 'paraśu' (axe), a 'kamala' (lotus), a 'mālā' and either sweetmeats (modaka), or a tusk (danta); and sometimes he wields a 'pāśa' (noose) and an 'aṅkuśa' (goad) instead of the axe and the lotus. On some occasions he has three eyes[23] or a crescent moon on his forehead,[24] or wears the gem called Cintāmaṇi on his bosom,[25] or is attended by Siddhi and Buddhi.[26] Although he is generally red and is clad in red garments, on one occasion he is described as being 'śaśi-varṇa'[27] and, on another, as being dressed in yellow silk (pīta-kauśeya-vasana).[28]

Next in popularity is Gaṇeśa's ten-handed form[29] which carries different kinds of weapons in its ten hands, has the moon on its forehead, wears a garland made of pearls or lotuses, has a white complexion, rides a lion, and is attended by Siddhi and Buddhi. In this form Gaṇeśa sometimes wears a garland of skulls and has five faces; or he may also have the gem called Cintāmaṇi on his bosom, or ride a peacock, or have a vermillion-red complexion.

Gaṇeśa, as described in the *Gaṇeśa-p.*, is a composite god[30] having many of the characteristics of Rudra-Śiva,

[23] *Gaṇ.* I. 21. 11, and 23. 11.

[24] *Gaṇ.* I. 15. 5, and 87. 33; II. 130. 5.

[25-26] *Gaṇ.* II. 130. 22.

[27] *Gaṇ.* I. 91. 29.

[28] *Gaṇ.* I. 20. 31.

[29] For description of this form see *Gaṇ.* I. 37. 10—13, 44. 26—28, 88. 32—35, and 90. 14—15, and II. 6. 22—25, and 17. 25—28.

[30] We have already said that the idea of the later Gaṇeśa is originally based on the identification of the Vināyakas with the Gaṇeśvaras. According to the *Gaṇeśa*—p., 'Vināyaka' and 'Gajânana', which differ in forms, are the distinct incarnations of the same god.

Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Indra, Varuṇa, Bṛhaspati, Kuvera, Kārttikeya, Durgā and others. This is evidenced not only by Gaṇeśa's paraphernalia (viz., the crescent moon, the serpent, the yellow garment, the goad, the lotus, the noose, the axe,[31] the missile Śakti, the mounts peacocks and lion, and so on), but also by the following names which are applied to him in his *Sahasra-nāma-stotra*: *Śambhu*, *Virūpākṣa*, Khaṇḍendu-kṛta-śekhara, Bhāla-candra, Śūlin, Khaṭvāṅgin, Paśupati, Paśu-pāśa-vimocaka, Śārṅgin, Gadādhara, Vanamālin, Carkapāṇi, Mahālakṣmī-priyatama, Bhāratī-sundarī-nātha, Sarasvatyāśraya, Vāgīśvarīpati, Sarojabhṛt, Vajrādy-astra-parīvāra, Pāśin, Brahmaṇaspati, Bṛhaspati, Nidhipati, Dhanapati, Dhanada, Sūrya-maṇḍala-madhyaga, and so on.[32] Various other aspects of Gaṇeśa's character are indicated by the following names which also occur in the *Gaṇeśa-sahasra-nāma-stotra*: Śavara, Buddhi-priya, Siddhi-priya, Siddhi-pati, Mohinī-pati, Jyeṣṭharāja, Sadyojāta, Gajapati, Cintāmaṇi-dvīpa-pati, Śāli-mañjarī-bhṛt, Kalpa-valli-dhara, Mudgarāyudha, Mātuliṅga-dhara, Cūta-kalikā-bhṛt, Gadya-padya-sudhārṇava, Gadya-gāna-priya, Cintāmaṇi, Arṇava-lālasa, Phala-hasta, Phāṇita--priya, Mantra-pati, Hasti-piśācīśa, Kṣetrādhipa, Parābhicāra-śamana, Supta-mātṛ-niṣevita, Aṣṭa-patrāmbujāsana, Aṣṭa-mātṛ-samāvṛta, Nava-nāgāsanādhyāsin, and Nava-durgā-niṣevita. Gaṇapati's names 'Bhāratī-sundarī-nātha', 'Sarasvatyā-śraya' and 'Vidyā-prada' and his description as a 'vidyādhipa-deva'[33] show that he was also looked upon as a god of learning.

A study of the *Gaṇeśa-p.* shows that Gaṇeśa was zealously worshipped by the Tantriks, both Hindu and

[31] According to *Ṛgveda* X. 53. 9 Brahmaṇaspati carried an iron axe.

[32] *Gaṇ.* I. 46. 8-9, 14-15, 17, 19-20, 46—52, 61, 65, 87, 99, 102, 105 and so on.

[33] *Gaṇ.* I. 90. 30.

Buddhist,[34] and that many Āgamas were written on the praise and worship of this god.[35] These Tantriks furnished Gaṇeśa with Śaktis,[36] evolved a large number of *mantras*[37] and used these for accomplishing various ends.[38] They regarded Gaṇeśa as the 'mantra-pati' (I. 46. 108) and sometimes worshipped him for saving themselves from black magic (abhicāra) practised against them by others (I. 46. 124). Gaṇeśa was no less popular with the Vāmācāra Tantriks than with the others. This is amply evidenced by his names 'Ucchiṣṭa-gaṇeśa', 'Ucchiṣṭa-gaṇa', 'Guhyācāra-rata', 'Guhyāgama-nirūpita' and 'Madaghūrṇita-locana ' as occurring in the *Gaṇeśa-sahasra-nāma-stotra*. As Gaṇeśa's association with Tantricism was not favourable to the varṇāśrama-dharma, the *Gaṇeśa-p.* was written to infuse Gāṇapatyaism with Vedic ideas. This work describes Gaṇeśa as 'trayīmaya' (I. 61. 43) and 'ṛg-yajuḥ-sāma-sambhūti' (I. 46. 78), regards him as the source of the Vedas (I. 51. 73), identifies him with the Vedic sacrifice (I. 46. 110), calls him 'yajña-pati' (I. 46. 110), and preaches that Gaṇeśa incarnated himself for establish-

[34] By analysing the legend of Gṛtsamada as occurring in the Upāsanā-khaṇḍa of the *Gaṇeśa-p.* Dr. Stevenson has shown that this legend as well as that of Narāntaka and Devāntaka in the Krīḍā-khaṇḍa is 'an allegorical representation of the conflict between Brahmanism and Buddhism'. See *JRAS,* VIII, pp. 319–329. According to *Gaṇ.* II. 47. 3ff. Viṣṇu appeared as a Buddha and preached anti-Vedic ideas.

[35] *Cf. Gaṇ.* I. 13. 8 (anekāgamaiḥ svaṁ janaṁ bodhayantaṁ sadā-sarva-rūpaṁ Gaṇeśaṁ namāmaḥ) and I. 13. 27 (ekākṣaraṁ ṣaḍarṇaṁ ca mantraṁ sarvāgamāṁs tathā/ harāya bhagavān prādāt........//).

[36] In *Gaṇ.* I. 46. 144 and 150 Gaṇapati is called 'ṣaṭ-śakti-parivārita ' and ' aṣṭa-śakti-samṛddha-śrī '.

[37] According to *Gaṇ.* I. 11. 3, seven crores of *mantras* are to be found in the Āgamas (sapta-koṭi-mahāmantrā gaṇeśasyāgame sthitāḥ/ tad-rahasyaṁ śivo veda........//).

[38] *Gaṇ.* I. 50. 2—mantrā nānā-vidhā devi nānā-siddhi-pradāyakāḥ.

ing the Vedic rites and customs.[39] But in spite of his high regard for the Vedas, the author of the *Gaṇeśa-p.* could not ignore 'Āgamas' (i.e. Tantras) totally. He repeatedly refers to these works as sources of the Gāṇapatya *mantras*,[40] prescribes the performances of nyāsas, mudrās etc. in Gaṇeśa-worship,[41] recognises the Tantric *yantra* as a medium of worship,[42] and advises the Gaṇeśa-worshippers to follow the directions of the Āgamas in the performance of *mantra-sandhyā*, *nyāsa*, etc. and the drawing of *yantras*.[43] He speaks of 'seven crores' of Āgamic *mantras* of Gaṇeśa (I. 11. 3), actually mentions those having one, two four, five, six, eight, ten, twelve, sixteen, eighteen or twenty-eight syllables,[44] and admits of Tantric symbolism in these, but he says that the Ṛgvedic *mahāmantra* 'gaṇānāṁ tvā etc.' is superior to all the Āgamic ones.[45] He also prescribes the use of the different verses of the Ṛgvedic Puruṣa-sūkta in summoning Gaṇeśa during his worship and in offering seat and other things to him.[46]

Although the *Gaṇeśa-p.* aims at infusing Gāṇapatyaism with Vedic ideas, it does not overlook its sectarian interest. It mentions various sectaries, viz., Vaikhānasas, Bhāgavatas, Sāttvatas, Pāñcarātras, Śaivas, Pāśupatas, Kālamukhas, Bhairavas, Śāktas, Sauras, Jainas and Ārhatas,[47]

---

[39] In *Gaṇ.* II. 41. 3 Gaṇeśa says to Pārvatī " mātas tvāṁ sevituṁ dharmaṁ kartuṁ karma ca vaidikam/ avatīrṇo 'smi............//." In *Gaṇ.* II. 43. 3 Ḍhuṇḍhirāja is said to have established the '*śruti-smṛti-kṛta mārga*' by killing the demon Durāsada. According to *Gaṇ.* I. 9. 37—39a and10. 2 Vyāsa wrote the eighteen Purāṇas and the eighteen Upapurāṇas for saving the Vedic *dharma* and elucidating the meanings of the Vedas.

[40] *Gaṇ.* I. 11. 3, 12. 9, and 69. 8.

[41] *Gaṇ.* I. 11, 18, 49 and so on.

[42] Cf. *Gaṇ.* I. 69. 14.

[43] *Gaṇ.* I. 11. 14, 49. 20, and 69. 14.

[44] *Gaṇ.* I. 11. 4ff., 20. 29, 46. 155, 50. 2ff., 51. 28, 91. 32-33, and so on.

[45] *Gaṇ.* I. 36. 19-20—gaṇānāṁ tveti......mahāmantraḥ........ āgamokteṣu mantreṣu......śreṣṭhaḥ........

[46] *Gaṇ.* I. 69. 17ff.

[47] *Gaṇ.* I. 46. 32-33.

but adds special importance to the Vaiṣṇavas, Sauras, Śāktas and Śaivas, whom it mentions at several places as worshipping Gaṇeśa in their Vedic and popular (*laukika*) rites.[48] The way in which Viṣṇu, Śiva, Pārvatī and other deities have been subordinated to Gaṇeśa, shows that the members of these four sects were the most powerful rivals of the Gaṇeśa-worshippers. It is most probably for this reason that in the *Gaṇeśa-p.* many of the exploits of infant Vināyaka have been conceived in imitation of those chiefly infant Kṛṣṇa of Vṛndāvana, that Vināyaka has been said on more occasions than one to have possessed, like Sūrya, the power of curing diseases, especially leprosy,[49] and that in one of his incarnations Vināyaka is said to have, like Durgā, ten hands and a lion as his *vāhana*.

We have already said that *Gaṇeśa-p.* is not mentioned in any of the lists of eighteen Upapurāṇas. So, the late origin of this work is quite obvious. It is familiar with term '*horā*', knows the names of rāśis and week-days, and utilises, in its *Gaṇeśa-gītā*, the language and contents of the Bhagavad-gītā. It testifies to the widespread popularity of the Pañcāyatana-pūjā[50] and has very late ideas regarding the images of Gaṇeśa. It repeatedly mentions the Āgamas (i.e. Tantras) as authoritative works, remarkably imbibes Tantric influence, refers to the various stories regarding the origin of Gajānana,[51] knows various 'Āga-

---

[48] *Gaṇ*. I. 45. 10-11, and 92. 44-45. See also *Gaṇ*. II. 138. 11ff. and 20-21.

[49] *Gaṇ*. I. 46. 189—192; II. 46. 18 and 151. 9. In *Gaṇ*. I, king Somakānta is said to have become free from leprosy by listening to the *Gaṇeśa*-p., and king Rukmāṅgada by worshipping Gaṇeśa at Cintāmaṇikṣetra.

[50] *Gaṇ*. II. 9. 11, 13, 37-38 and 47.

[51] *Gaṇ*. II. 149. 6-7a—
śambhu-vaktrāc ca krodhāc ca prādurbhūto gajānanaḥ/
gauryāś ca tejaso jāta udarāc ca kvacin mune//
kvacid gaurī-malāc cāpi............./

Cf. also the names 'Śambhu-vaktrodbhava', 'Śambhu-hāsyabhū', 'Umāṅga-malaja' and 'Svardhunī-bhava' given to Gaṇeśa in his *Sahasra-nāma-stotra* (verses 23-24).

mas, and other works describing the different forms of this deity,[52] speaks of the 'eighteen Purāṇas'[53] and the 'eighteen Upapurāṇas',[54] and names the '*Nāradīya*' and the '*Nṛsimha*' Upapurāṇa.[55] It knows the '*Laiṅga*'[56] and the '*Skānda*'[57] and refers to some of their contents. That it is later than the *Mudgala-p.* and the *Śāradā-tilaka* is shown by the fact that these two works speak of thirty-two and fifty-one forms of Gaṇapaṭi respectively, whereas the *Gaṇeśa-p.* catalogues fifty-six forms.[58] By its statement that Dakṣa, who was mortified at the destruction of his sacrifice, heard from Mudgala the Purāṅa on the praise of Gaṇeśa,[59] and by its mention of Mudgala as a great devotee of Gaṇapati in many places, the *Gaṇeśa-p.* refers unmistakably to the *Mudgala-p.*[60] Hence this work cannot be dated earlier

---

[52] *Gaṇ.* I. 13. 8, and II. 149. 6–8.

[53] *Gaṇ.* I. 1. 4, 9. 38, and 46. 160; II. 150. 11 and 14, and 155, 48.

[54] *Gaṇ.* I. 1. 8, and 9. 39; II. 150. 15.

[55] For the relevant verse see footnote 2 above.

[56] *Gaṇ.* II. 149. 9b–

śivād brahmā ca viṣṇuś ca laiṅge jātau nirūpitau.

This line refers to the present *Liṅga-p.*, in which Śiva has been described as the original source of Brahmā and Viṣṇu.

[57] *Gaṇ.* II. 149. 10a–

skānde vidhātur netrāc ca śivotpattir nirūpitā.

The story of Ḍhuṇḍhirāja and Divodāsa in *Gaṇ.* II. 38–48 must have been based on *Skanda-p.* IV (Kāśī-khaṇḍa), chaps. 39–58. According to *Gaṇ.* II. 38. 20-21 this story was originally narrated by 'Skanda' to 'Agastya' In the above-mentioned chapters of the *Skanda-p.* (Kāśī-khaṇḍa) also, Skanda speaks to Agastya.

[58] *Gaṇ.* II. 42. 11 (vināyakaḥ......../ ṣaṭ-pañcāśanmitá mūrtiś cakārāsau sva-tejasā//), and 33b (evaṁ vināyakasyātha kāśyāṁ ṣáṭ-pañca-mūrtayaḥ); II. 43. 10 (sthitā vārāṇasīṁ trātuṁ ṣaṭ-pañcāśad vināyakāḥ). For the names of these 'fifty-six' forms of Vināyaka at Benares see *Gaṇ.* II. 154.

[59] *Gaṇ.* I. 9. 63—yajña-vidhvaṁsa-śokārto dakṣaḥ śuśrāva mudgalāt.

[60] J. N. Farquhar thinks that the *Mudgala-p.* was written later than *Gaṇeśa-p.*—See Farquhar, *Outline of the Religious Literature of India*, p. 270.

than 1100 A. D. Again, the *Gaṇeśa-p.* has been drawn upon in Tryambaka Oka's *Ācāra-bhūṣaṇa*[61] which was written in 1741 Śaka (=1819 A. D.); there is a Ms of the *Gaṇeśa-p.* which is dated 1685 Śaka (=1763 A. D.);[62] in his *ASB Cat.*, V, pp. 789-91 H. P. Shastri describes a Ms of the *Gaṇeśa-gītā* (belonging to the *Gaṇeśa-p.*) which is dated 1616 Śaka (=1694 A. D.) and is furnished with the commentary *Gaṇapati-bhāva-dīpikā* of Nīlakaṇṭha, son of Govinda-sūri; and in his *Notices*, IV, p. 32 R. L. Mitra describes a Ms of the *Gaṇeśa-sahasra-nāma-stotra* which bears the date Śaka 1549 (=1627 A. D.) and contains the commentary of Gopālabhaṭṭa, surnamed Ḍāva. So, *the date of the Gaṇeśa-p. falls between* 1100 *and* 1400 A.D. J. N. Farquhar also places it between 900 and 1350 A. D.[63] But Dr. Stevenson is inclined to assign this work to a much later date. He says: "The former, called the Upāsanā Khaṇḍa of the Purāṇa, could sacrcely have been written before the seventeenth century of our era, as Moreśvara (Sans. Mayūreśvara) is mentioned as a great Tīrtha of Gaṇeśa; but still Morabhaṭṭa, who flourished in the former half of that century, gave it celebrity, and originated the Chinchore (Chinchvad) incarnate Gaṇapatis, it was a place

---

[61] P. 187—

gaṇeśa-purāṇe pūjāyāṃ—

nyūnātirikta-pūjāyāḥ saṁpūrṇa-phala-hetave/
dakṣiṇāṁ kāñcanīṁ deva sthāpayāmi tavāgrataḥ//

and p. 189—

gaṇeśa-priyāṇi—

haritāḥ śveta-varṇā vā pañca-tri-patra-saṁyutāḥ/
dūrvāṅkurā mayā dattā ekaviṁśati-sammitāḥ//

iti gaṇeśa-purāṇe.

These quoted verses are the same as *Gaṇ.* I. 49. 60b—61a and 62b—63a respectively.

[62] Shastri and Gui, *Calcutta Sans. College Cat.*, IV, pp. 18-19.

[63] Farquhar, *Outline of the Religious Literature of India*, pp. 226 and 270.

altogether unknown to fame. * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * The second Khaṇḍa of the Purāṇa refers to the first, and therefore must have been written after it."[64] However, it is due to this late origin of the *Gaṇeśa-p.* that it is not referred to or drawn upon in any of the comparatively early Smṛti Nibandhas and commentaries.

Mss of the *Gaṇeśa-p.* are extremely rare in Bengal. As a matter of fact, we do not know of even one Ms of this work which has been discovered in this province or is written in Bengali characters. That the author of the *Gaṇeśa-p.* had no sympathy for, and knowledge about, Bengal, is shown by his statements that the city of Tripura (which Śiva destroyed with a single arrow) was situated in "Baṅgāla"[65] and that there was a 'Baṅgāla-nagara' in 'Baṅgāla-viṣaya'.[66] On the other hand, Benares figures prominently in this work, and many of the exploits of Vināyaka are located in this city. Hence it is highly probable that this work was written at Benares. Burnell informs us that the *Gaṇeśa-p.* 'is not recognised in South India either as a Purāṇa or Upapurāṇa'.[67]

Before concluding this section we should refer to a few interesting points mentioned in the *Gaṇeśa-p.* According to *Gaṇ.* I. 50. 32-33 the immersion of the image of Gaṇeśa at the end of the Vināyaka-caturthī-vrata is to be performed in the following way. The image is to be decorated with umbrellas, flags etc., placed in a car drawn by men, and taken to a big pool in a procession which is to be led by boys (kiśoraiḥ) fighting among themselves with sticks; and after immersion, all are to return to their respective

---

[64] *JRAS,* VIII, p. 319.

[65] For the relevant verse see footnote 10 above.

[66] *Gaṇ.* I. 74. 9 and 13.

[67] Burnell, *Classified Index,* p. 187.

houses with songs and beat of drums.[68] In *Gaṇ*. I. 54. 20 and II. 1. 34 there is mention of the custom of sending sweets (śarkarā) and betel-leaves to the houses of neighbours on special occasions such as the birth of a son. *Gaṇ*. I. 4.2-3 refer to the various kinds of coloured clothes made in Kashmir;[69] and in *Gaṇ*. I. 39. 2 and II. 31. 21 there is mention of the construction of images of Gaṇeśa with Kashmir stone. By its directions that in Gaṇeśa-worship the 'twenty-one' names of this deity are to be recited,[70] that 'twenty-one' fruits[71] and 'twenty-one' twigs of Dūrvā grass[72] are to be offered to Gaṇeśa, that the worshipper is to go round the images of the deity 'twenty-one' times,[73] that at least 'twenty-one' Brāhmaṇas are to be honoured and fed on this occasion,[74] that 'twenty-one' kinds of gifts are to be made to these Brāhmaṇas,[75] and that 'twenty-one' coins (mudrāḥ) are to be given to the priest as his honorarium (dakṣiṇa),[76] the *Gaṇeśa-p*. seems to regard the number 'twenty-one' as a sacred one.

---

[68] aparasmin dine mūrtiṁ nṛ-yāne sthāpayen mudā/
chatra-dhvaja-pātākābhiś cāmarair upaśobhitām//
kiśorair daṇḍa-yuddhena yudhyadbhiś ca puraḥsarām/
mahājalāśayaṁ gatvā visṛjya ninayej jale//
vādya-gīta-dhvani-yuto nija-mandiram āvrajet//

[69] vāsāṁsi.......nānā-varṇāni kāśmīra-deśajani........

[70] *Gaṇ*. I. 46. 215—7, and 69. 46f.

[71] *Gaṇ*. I. 69. 55.

[72] *Gaṇ*. I. 49. 62, 69. 46, and 87. 8.

[73] *Gaṇ*. I. 49. 62.

[74] *Gaṇ*. I. 51. 45, and 87. 9-10.

[75] *Gaṇ*. I. 87. 10.

[76] *Gaṇ*. I. 87. 7.

MṚCCHAKAṬIKA AS A PRAKARAṆA

By Kumari Bhakti Sudha Mukhopadhyaya

Mṛcchakaṭika is a Prakaraṇa. Prakaraṇa is a variety of the Sanskrit drama in which the Vastu or plot is a creation of the poet, though nothing prevents the author from weaving the story round a well-known hero. This means that the theme should not be khyātavṛtta, i.e., not borrowed from legends or traditions. Herein lies the essential difference between a Nāṭaka and a Prakaraṇa[1] With the publication of the so-called *Bhāsa-nāṭaka-cakra* in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, a theory has been started that the *Mṛcchakaṭika* is only an amplification of the *Cārudatta-nāṭaka*, published in that series, so closely do the two agree with each other. If the *Mṛcchakaṭika* is a Prakaraṇa it cannot be assumed to have borrowed[2] its plot and text from the *Cārudatta*; and Indian literary tradition has all along characterised it as a Prakaraṇa. Hence the Bhasite theory of amplification cannot stand. Textual resemblances find satisfactory explanation on the theory of adaptation advanced by Prof. K. R. Pisharoti. The Bhasite view of textual amplification need not therefore be considered as an argument against accepting the *Mṛcchakaṭika* as a Prakaraṇa, as our literary tradition has always treated it. It is proposed to set forth here certain features of a Prakaraṇa mentioned by Bharata, which are not generally noticed. One of the characteristics of a Pra-

[1] *Nāṭyaśāstram* edited by Batuk Nath Sharma, XX., 51.

[2] Indian literary tradition calls *Mṛcchakaṭika* a Prakaraṇa and the editor of the *Bhāsa-Nāṭaka-Cakra* calls the *Cārudatta* a Nāṭaka. This sets forth the relation in which the two stand to each other. Literary tradition does not countenance the view that the *Mṛ*. has borrowed the theme. Therefore, the theme could not have been an elaboration. On the other hand, *Cārudatta* could well be a Nāṭaka because it is based on the *Mṛ*.

karaṇa mentioned by Bharata is that it is anāyakahāryakārya. The phrase means 'nāyakena hāryaṁ kāryaṁ na bhavati yatra, tathā nāyakādanyena, upanāyakena vā hāryaṁ kāryaṁ bhavati yasmin'.[3] The idea is that the denouement of the plot results from the activities of somebody other than the Nāyaka, the Upanāyaka or Pratināyaka. If we view the *Mṛcchakaṭika* from this point of view, it would be seen that the plot in it develops through the activities of Śarvilaka, Śakāra and finally Saṃsthānaka, the latter playing a prominent part in the resolution of the plot, and the former two in the complication. Thus Śarvilaka's love-affair and his activities in the furtherance thereof lead to the first stage of the complication of the plot and to the final crisis and these are carried forward and hurried to the crisis through Vasantasenā's reaction of the love-advances of Śakāra and his dastardly attack on Vasantasenā, followed by his foisting the guilt upon Cārudatta who was saved from the gallows by the timely arrival of Vasantasenā through the first aid administered to her by Saṃsthānaka. Thus the denouement of the plot is due not to the purposive activity of the hero, Cārudatta, but results entirely from the activities of the Upanāyaka and the Pratināyaka. In this feature also then the *Mṛcchakaṭika* satisfies the condition laid down by Bharata.

Here, however, a question may be asked : Does not the *Mudrārākṣasa* show the same feature and does not it also deserve to be termed a Prakaraṇa from this point of view? The answer is clear. That text is not a Prakaraṇa, because though the action is carried forward by the activities of Cāṇakya and Rākṣasa, these two are working on behalf of their own proteges and not for their own sake. On the other hand, in the *Mṛcchakaṭika*, the Upanāyaka and Pratināyaka function in their own interest and not in the

[3] *N. S.* XX, 56.

interest of Cārudatta. Thus in so far as anāyakahāryakāryaṁ is concerned, there is a specific difference between the *Mṛcchakaṭika* and the *Mudrārākṣasa*; and because of this difference while the former is a Prakaraṇa, the latter is a Nāṭaka.

The expression anāyakahāryakāryaṁ has two vraiants: first anarthamapahāryakāryaṁ and second anārṣamapahāryakāryaṁ.[4] Both these may be taken to mean the same. The term anārṣa means adhārmika and that is anartha which may be taken to mean what is not to be desired, what is not to be coveted. To love a courtesan is always fraught with danger and therefore should have been avoided, particularly by one who occupies the position which Cārudatta has. Apart from the morality of such an action, in this particular case there was scope for scandal, for people would say that he was covetous of her riches as the sequal showed the supposed murder of Vasantasenā was foisted upon him and circumstantial evidence proved his guilt and he would have paid with his life but for her timely arrival. His action is Adhārmic—not countenanced by the code of Dharma. The first citizen of Ujjain by virtue of his character, a husband, a father and a religious man—Cārudatta should not have lent himself to be beguiled by a courtesan. Quite consistent with this again are the many other elements in the drama, such for instance as stealing, gambling, fighting, strangling, abuse of law etc. Thus the hero and the Vastu are alike Adhārmic and should have been eschewed; and indeed from higher point of view the depiction of the incidents does not help the re-creation of Dharma, as Bharata has set forth, however much it might help recreation and as such it fails to satisfy the purpose of a drama. Thus even if the variants are accepted, the text satisfies the description as laid down by Bharata.

---

[4] *Vide ibid.*

There are many other elements in the drama which provide us with the sense of surprise. The most prominent is the social aspect of the drama which is a reflex of real life. The drama has drawn upon characters from different strata of society and has done full justice to everyone, thus giving it a plebian atmosphere.

These are some of the extraordinary qualities of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* and in this respect too it satisfies the definition given by Bharata.[5]

The *Nāṭyaśāstra* sets forth that a Prakaraṇa must have many and varied actions of a Brāhmaṇa minister[6] or a priest but the enjoyment of a Nāyaka of regal[7] or divine origin or association is tabooed here. The action of the play is carried forward by Bāhyajanas or Nīcapātras,[8] or by the people outside the pale of noble (or Āryan) society.

A Prakaraṇa must have slaves, courtiers and merchants in it and the lawful wife of the hero must be here of very passive character—almost a negation.

There should be no courtesan[9] where the domestic life of a minister, Brāhmaṇa-priest, Brāhmaṇa-merchant etc. is to be described and there is no scope for a lawful wife in case there is a courtesan. That means both a courtesan and a lawful wife cannot play active roles in the same Prakaraṇa. If they happen to co-exist they never meet each other on the stage and one of them (the wife, in all likelihood) plays a passive[10] role. The distribution of language must conform to the rules of dramaturgy, i.e. must be natural. The number of Acts in a Prakaraṇa varies from 5 to 10

[5] *Vide ibid.*

[6] *Ibid*, 52.

[7] *Ibid*, 53.

[8] *Ibid*, 54.

[9] *Ibid*, 55.

[10] *Ibid*, 57—58.

and they are meant to represent different emotions and sentiments.

Now we have to examine how far the *Mṛcchakaṭika* conforms to the rest of the definition. The hero is a Brāhmaṇa-merchant. He has no regal or divine descent but is a very ordinary being and there are many Nīcapātras in the drama.

The second interpretation of Bāhyajanasamprayukta also suits here well. Samvāhaka, the Buddhist mendicant, is the main personality who shapes the final denouement of the drama, having carried on its action through a certain course and given a decisive turn at the climax.

Dhutā, the wife of Cārudatta, is just a nonentity. If she has to do anything it is to secure the safety, honour and happiness of her husband. There is no trace of jealousy and to interpret her love psychologically, its sex-aspect is converted into maternal-aspect. The *Mṛcchakaṭika* being a vikṛta type of Prakaraṇa, the wife and the courtesan do exist at the same time but never meet each other save at the time when Nīlakaṇṭha's extreme zeal of creating an atmosphere of happiness and union, makes them meet together at the end. The original makes no breach of rule.

The distribution of language also is strictly conventional. Usually we find that aristocratic male characters speak in Sanskrit in a drama, ordinary male characters and ladies speak in Śaurasenī, Mahārāṣṭrī is limited to the field of poetry and Māgadhī is spoken by lower characters. Besides this, dramatic canon allows that different people are entitled to talk in their respective provincial dialects but this is rarely observed strictly in most of the dramas. Our drama is the typical one which has got different dialects according to dramatic convention. Avantī, Prācya, Ḍhakkī, the language of the Deccan people, are properly distributed in it. Thus we find the *Mṛcchakaṭika* fulfils all the conditions of a Prakaraṇa enumerated in the *Nāṭyaśastra*.

With the publication of the *Bhāsa-nāṭaka-cakra* in T. S. S. the theory has been started that the *Mṛcchakaṭika* is an amplification of the *Cārudatta*. On the ground of the four Acts of the former resembling closely the entire plot of the latter—a four-Act drama—with but little variance here and there some scholars argue that the *Mṛcchakaṭika* is the text ornatior of the *Cārudatta*.

The definition of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* itself is a solution to this problem. According to it either the *Mṛcchakaṭika* cannot be called a Prakaraṇa at all if it is assumed to have borrowed the plot, or if it is a real Prakaraṇa, the amplification theory is an idle talk.

There are ample reasons to believe that the *Mṛcchakaṭika* has not drawn upon the *Cārudatta* but is in itself an original work :

(a) The drama fulfils all the conditions required to be satisfied in a Prakaraṇa. Why should it make a breach of the rule with reference to the essential distinctive feature, i.e., the invention of the theme by the poet?

(b) If anybody has enough capability and creative genius to elaborate and improve upon another's composition, why should he not produce an original work? Human psychology does not support it.

(c) There is no specific proof for confirming the theory of elaboration.

(d) In most cases, the sentences, verses, ideas and thoughts are quite identical in both the texts. Somewhere, of course, some sentences may appear a little ornamented in the *Mṛcchakaṭika* when compared with the *Cārudatta* but they are too insignificant to make an amplified text. It should not have been content with such a little variation but should have had more ornamented and elaborated expressions, striking and remarkable changes in ideas, feelings and thoughts. But our drama has got only the minimum

change and this is not the characteristic change of a purposely elaborated work.

In spite of these, nobody can deny the fact that somehow or other the *Mṛcchakaṭika* is related to the *Cārudatta*. It appears that the latter is an abridgement of the former, trimmed of all incidents developing after Vasantasenā's decision to go to Cārudatta's home and only for this the *Cārudatta* had to strike out events and expressions that anticipate, indicate and involve certain later developments.

We may not even call it a Nāṭaka though this particular type of drama enjoys the privilege of borrowing the theme because it is only an abridgement of a well arranged drama. The *Cārudatta* is neither an original Nāṭaka but it came into existence with the specific purpose of stage-representation of the bulky drama. The Prakaraṇa was shortened with an eye to character-economy, incident-economy and time-economy.

The drama fulfils fully even the fundamental purpose of a Nāṭaka according to the orthodox canon of Sanskrit poetics. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* declares its divine origin. Bharata while narrating the mythical origin of the drama says that once[11] all the gods approached Brahmā and prayed to him for something for their diversion which would both form a spectacle to their eyes as well as be heard by ears. It was to be as sacred, moralising and elevating as the Vedas, to which the Śūdras have no access. Therefore it was to be a separate and new Veda for all.[12]

Accordingly, Brahmā created the drama which was religious, of practical utility, fame-yielding, full of morals, a treasure of good maxims and was the guide for future generations in their multifarious activities.[13] The drama

[11] *N.S.* I, 11.
[12] *Ibid.* 12.
[13] *Ibid.* 14.

was full of Śāstric precepts and contained references to arts current at that time or it acted as an illuminator to all disciples.[14]

Now we have to see how far these principles are to be found in our drama.

It depicts religion in a great degree and clearly shows how retribution comes if there is deviation from the track of religion. While depicting the hero, the author has not only portrayed him as a man always observing high religious principles but he was stuck upon religious rituals also, even when in straitened circumstances. So the author has depicted religion both in resume and in concrete forms. Moreover, Cārudatta is not fruit seeking in observing religious duties but he abides by religion for its own sake[15], a characteristical mark of Hindu religion. He is honest, truthful, generous, pious, charitable, forgives even his declared enemy and thus is piety incarnate. In the very beginning, we find, Cārudatta, who was born with a silver spoon in his mouth, has lost all riches but renown he still retains. As he is under malign fate, that also is to forsake him, the wealth of character is at jeopardy, as a result of his contact with a courtesan. Even such religious and learned man loses the sense of 'to be or not to be' when under the spell of love. Cārudatta, an otherwise sober man, was infatuated by the thrill of romance and having violated the rules of higher ethics had liaison with Vasantasenā to reap the fruit of the same eventually.

The drama is of great practical utility because it portrays almost all the phases of human life. The poet is never vertical in his imagination but is horizontal, dealing always with the problems of the life of common people and thus has a realistic appeal to the modern mind.

---

[14] *Ibid*, 15. There is a second reading for सर्वशिल्पप्रदर्शकम् as सर्वशिष्यप्रदर्शकम्.

[15] *Mr*. I. 16.

Poverty, the most intricate and baffling, the acutest and almost commonest problem of life and love, the noblest and the natural emotion of life are portrayed here in all complexities and these, according to the dramatic canon, are hinted at in the Nāndī. These are the fields where people should take very careful steps lest walking unwisely one slips on the way and falls down. Life is not a smooth course—not a bed of roses with most people (except for a lucky few). Fate lowers the position of some people, it gives fulfilment of life to some, some attain prosperity through it, some are led towards prosperity only to be upset again. All these fluctuations of life lead Cārudatta to philosophise that life passes on in कूपयन्त्रघटिकान्याय[16] so says the *Mṛcchakaṭika*.

Though its language is not very erudite and style simple and direct unlike other dramatic pieces of elaborate character, it is not regarded as a lesser luminary than the other stars seen in the galaxy of Sanskrit literature. It is quite natural that a work having so many good qualities should be fame-yielding.

It is full of morals, has many maxims of practical interest. As it points out to the dire development resulting from some weakness of Cārudatta, it is an eye-opener to the common run of people. It further shows how ultimately honesty and nobility save a man even from death, how the contact with a courtesan leads to trouble, how the sense of duty predominates even when one is rapt in love, how lovely and insignificant people can achieve something great and good if there is sincerity, and so on.

On account of these qualities it is a guide in the social life of people. A drama deals with every aspect of society, characters being drawn from every stratum of it and therefore is a guide in all activities of life.

---

[16] *Mṛ*. X, 59.

It is interesting in other ways also, as it refers, by the way, to the social life of the people, in more aspects than one. The drama informs us of arts current at the time of its composition, namely, Vaiśikī art, vocal and instrumental music, shampooing, gambling, clay-modelling, painting, dancing, jewellery, cooking and many other arts including stealing.

Thus we see that the *Mṛcchakaṭika* fulfils almost all conditions of a Prakaraṇa.

INFLUENCE OF THE TEACHINGS OF THE BUDDHA AND THE CAUSES OF THE DECLINE OF BUDDHISM IN INDIA

By UMESHA MISHRA

IT is a fact of everyday experience of every conscious being that the world is full of miseries and that no one can escape them. So it is natural that everyone should be eager to hear and follow the Path of Remedy. The Message of Deliverance becomes much more attractive if it comes from one who has himself successfully followed it. Hence when Gautama Buddha after attaining the Buddhahood came to preach his experiences to the people at large, they, irrespective of caste and creed, age and sex, gathered round about him in thousands to hear his charming, sublime and most welcome Message of Deliverance with rapt attention. The Buddha, it appears, did not care to make any selection in his audience. Everyone needed his teachings for the remedy of his or her miseries. People, credulous as they naturally were, became very much impressed with the magnetic personality of the Teacher and his sublime teachings. They were carried away by his peaceful Message of Deliverance with hopes within themselves of becoming freed from the tortures of sufferings in case they followed his Path. But it seems to me, that all this was due to their being overpowered by sentiment and emotion. They do not seem at all to have thought of the grave consequences which would result if the Message were followed merely out of sentiment and not after actually acquiring the *adhikāra* to receive it.

It is to be kept in mind that those men and women who became fascinated with the wonderful result which Gautama Buddha had himself achieved, namely, the Enlightenment and subsequently, the final cessation of

pain, did not care much for the means which had helped the Buddha to achieve that success. In other words, they overlooked, under the influence of the spell cast over them by the magnetic personality of the Master and his sublime teachings, the importance of *Sādhanā* (austere penance accompanied by the rigid discipline of body and mind) which alone had helped the Buddha to succeed, and ran away from society to lead the life of a recluse after the allurement of getting the Enlightenment alone, without the least idea of the fact that the latter exclusively depended upon the former. It is perhaps, therefore, that no importance was ever attached to the *Karmakṣetra* of Uruwelā where the Buddha had performed austere penances before the attainment of the Buddhahood.

It may be admitted that all those who listened to the teachings were not equally qualified for the sort of life which the Buddha preached to lead. Naturally, the effect produced on them also widely differed. No doubt, a few of them might have been really qualified, but it may be said with certain confidence that a large majority of them was certainly not at all qualified. So when they listened to the solacing message of freedom, they did not pause for a while to think of their worldly duties and responsibilities towards their relations in the family as well as in the society, but in their emotional mood without being really disgusted with the world they left their homes immediately and became mendicants. The family or the society which needed their assistance very badly must have consequently suffered a good deal in various ways by such thoughtless mass renunciations. The result of the hasty step of the people was that though they became mendicants, yet they could not observe the rigid rules laid down for that sort of life, and consequently, they might have done many things which they should not have done otherwise. The vigour of emotion could not last for long. Gradually, it began

to diminish. They failed to maintain the balance of mind and body and retain the spirit of the teachings of the Master for a long time. This led them to lead an idle and aimless life. Such persons might not have even liked to return to society for fear of being ridiculed and laughed at. People in the society also might have tried their best to persuade them directly and indirectly to return to their old society, but all in vain. The mendicants claimed to justify their position through reasonings for which the non-Buddhists also became prepared. This was the time when Gautama, the reputed logician of Mithilā, wrote his *Nyāyasūtra* with all the methods of disputation. But all this did not improve the situation. Differences grew wider and wider. Mutual hatred and jealousy continued with greater force.

The Buddha and his prominent disciples seem to have formed an association of these recluses. Rigid rules and ways of discipline were framed for them. They were, it may be said, free from worldly anxieties and were certainly happy for some time. Admission to the Order (Sangha) was limited to a certain extent, yet the conditions for joining it were external and not internal. In the beginning perhaps, the qualifications needed might have been only verbal promises. But it seems that no effort was made at the time of the Buddha, by the authorities to find out whether the members of the Order were really fit to observe those rules and also whether all the rules were really capable of being followed by them. Besides the exact number of these recluses who formed the Order there were many more who lived like them and remained in their company. It was because of this that at one time their number grew beyond computation and Dharmāśoka had to ask Moggaliputta Tissa to turn them out and yet their number was in thousands. Another so-called advantage which these recluses got was that the

rules framed for them were not recorded in writing anywhere. These idle wanderers therefore could easily interpret them to their own advantage and convenience whenever they liked as is clear from a study of the *Kathāvatthu*.

Let us now turn for a while to the teachings of the Vedas. No doubt, they had also taught to take to the life of a recluse to seek after the highest aim of life. The final aim of both the Vedic and the Buddhistic teachings being the same there was prehaps no difference in the method of maintaining discipline of body and mind. But the Vedic teachings were reserved and not meant for all on equal basis. Their teachings were quite different for different types of people and were based on the individual fitness of the persons to be admitted to such teachings. Consideration of their fitness (adhikāritva) was foremost in the mind of the Vedic teachers, as a result of which only such persons could enter into the life of a mendicant and subsequently to the highest teachings as had passed through the vicissitudes of life and had really become disgusted with the world and had thus qualified themselves for that sort of life. Such persons had felt a natural longing for retirement from the active life of the world to the peaceful state of a recluse, thinking and meditating upon the means of realising the highest truth. Of course, those who were not found so qualified, had other types of teachings in accordance with their spiritual fitness. So there was no clash of any kind amongst the people. Hence, while leading that sort of new life they were quite convinced that they had done all their duties towards their relations in the society and that there was left practically nothing in the world to be done by them. Thus they had a sort of natural retirement for the realisation of the highest aim of life. So once a person entered into that retired life, neither had he any repentance for what he did, nor did his relations ever feel that he had not

done anything for them and that he had left his family in utter disappointment and chaos.

It is needless to point out here that these people also were, like the followers of the Buddha, tortured by worldly afflictions and were eager to follow the Message of Deliverance. So when they approached their Vedic teachers they had qualified themselves to receive such teachings. They had become really disgusted with the ways of the world and were very eager to be freed from the active life of the world. The Vedic teachers were very much reserved and they did not invite people at large to all their teachings. When they were approached by the enquirers after truth, the teachers did their best to test the merits of the enquirers and admitted them to their teachings only after they were convinced of their fitness. The result of such a test was that the teachings were never given to unqualified persons, nor did the teachings were ever misinterpreted or misused. They made the best use of the teachings and though they had also in a way left their society, yet they were regarded much more helpful to the society. Again, though the teachings were oral yet as they were given to such safe and really qualified persons they proved to be very useful both to them and to the society at large. The enquirers were also very happy and contented; they could have never any ill feeling towards their teachers.

But when we look to the disciples of the Buddha we find that most of them were confused and quite ignorant as to the exact nature of the teachings. There being no test of the fitness of the disciples the teachings were very much misunderstood and also misinterpreted by them. They also did not like them (the teachings) to their full satisfaction. All this led them to form different opinions and behave accordingly. But they did not express their resentment during the life-time of their Master. That there were many who were dissatisfied with the teachings of the Master and

did not like Him is evident from the instance of Subhadda as given in the *Mahāparinibbānasutta*. Again, that all such feelings of the disciples were not concealed from the Master is obvious from His last words addressed to Ānanda, "When I am gone, Ānanda! let the Order, if it should so desires, abolish all the lesser and minor precepts". Again, the Master says, "When I am gone, Ānanda! let the higher penalty (*brahmadaṇḍo*) be imposed upon Sanna (a Bhikkhu)"; "Let Sanna say whatever he may like, Ānanda! the Bhikkhus should neither speak to him, nor exhort him, nor advise him" (*Mahāparinibbānasutta*, VI. 228-30).

From all this we gather that there was enough cause for schism in the Order even during the life time of the Master. But while he was alive not much trouble could rise. So writes Yamakami Sogen, "As is well known to most of you, in Buddha's life-time his disciples were saved from the curse of a schism, thanks to the magnetic personality of the teacher. But tradition relates that when 116 years had elasped after the death of the Great Teacher, there arose amongst his followers a violent controversy regarding the theory and practice of the Vinaya or the rules of the Order, which divided them, at last into two bitterly antagonastic camps." (*Systems of Buddhistic Thoughts*, p. 99).

Again, we find that at the time of the third Council, there was so much corruption in the Order that several thousands of the disciples had to be turned out of the Order. So writes R. S. Hardy, "They continued the practice of many things that were contrary to the Vinaya. When these abuses came to the knowledge of Dharmāśoka, he commanded Moggaliputta Tissa to expel from the priesthood 60,000 tīrthakas who had transgressed the ordinances..." (*Eastern Monachism*, p. 183). So says Dr. Winternitz also, "About hundred years after the passing of the Buddha, a schism occurred, which stirred up so much controversy, that a great assembly of monks had to be summoned, to decide

what should be regarded as right, with reference to the debatable points." (*History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, p. 5).

From all these reports we gather that there was a good deal of confusion and dissatisfaction amongst the disciples of the Buddha regarding the teachings. As they were not recorded, the disciples, particularly those who wanted change in the rules according to their own interest, had enough opportunity to assert their own individual interpretations to suit their conveniences. This was mainly discussed amongst those disciples who were not sincere and were leading the life of idle wanderers. It was not possible to put any check over the spread of these ideas which subsequently led to the grouping of the disciples into several independent schools. No doubt thoughts of dissatisfaction were brewing in the very life time of the Buddha, but his personality did not give them any chance to burst up. But no sooner the Master had passed away than every one began to insist on one's own interpretation as is quite clear from the utterances of Subhadda (vide-*Cullavagga*, II. 7). Though the schism appeared in its full form after some time, yet it should be kept in mind that it could not have been a work of a year or so. All this most likely began during the very life time of the Great Master as has been indicated above from various references. So it seems that the ultimate result of the teachings of the Buddha was disappointment in society and chaos in the Order. Those persons who failed to observe the discipline of the Order did not like to return to their old society for fear of being ridiculed and laughed at. So they preferred to remain aimless idle wanderers. People in society tried their best in vain to persuade them to return to their old fold.

Such an idle life led by these people might have become the chief cause of their corruption in many ways. They

began to feel as if they belonged to an entirely different group of people, so much so that they hated non-Buddhists and kept themselves as far as possible aloof from them. This attitude of the followers of the Buddha could not at all be relished by others.

Buddhism had its birth and existence in India with Buddha's sublime Message of Deliverance and was honoured because of the magnanimous character of the Teacher and his teachings. It seems that these teachings were delivered in the language of the people, namely Pālī, and not in Sanskrit. Soon his teachings became very popular and attracted a very large number of followers. As long as the personal influence of the Buddha could command, no one could openly create any trouble in the Order. Non-interference with the extremists was one of the main causes of the success of the Buddha.

But when we turn to the other aspect of his teachings, namely, the effect produced on the followers of the Order and also on society, as has been pointed out above, we find that the immature mental equipment of these followers, their hurried decision to become recluses without having a natural longing for that sort of disciplined life, the hard and rigid rules of the Order and above all the deliverance of the Message of peace to all without any consideration of their fitness and also their peculiar attitude of keeping themselves aloof and thinking of themselves as belonging to an exclusively different culture, as they think themselves even these days, all combined together and proved fatal to the very aim of the Order. The unqualified followers must have begun to take part in activities not meant for the life of a recluse. The slackness in the performance of their duty towards the Order brought split amongst them and several schools and sub-schools appeared soon after the passing away of the Teacher. These splits continued to multiply in large number. Every

school claimed its own authenticity and superiority. Discontent spread all round both within and outside the Order. All this carried them away far from the original ideals of the Order.

It is obvious from the above that both the rise and the decline of Buddhism began almost simultaneously. The new religion could not keep its followers bound together with mutual love and tolerance. On one side we find the preaching of the highest ideal of peaceful Nirvāṇa, while on the other, there was dissatisfaction and non-tolerance amongst the followers of the Order. Decline continued and further disintegration entered into the fold through various channels and passed through several vicissitudes. It seems at times it gained strength with the appearance of some really talented supporters and scholars which stopped the downward flow for some time. But then again, its fall came with greater acceleration after the disappearance of that support. In course of this gradual decline the followers of Buddhism, due to various misunderstandings, grew more and more jealous of those who preached against Buddhism and naturally provoked their rivals who, in their turn, did not spare them and tried to take revenge whenever possible. Various methods were adopted by both the parties to do injury to each other. They met on public platforms for disputations with an understanding of converting the defeated party into the religion of the winner and sometimes the defeated party had to become slave of the other party. Sometimes this led to disastrous results. So there was a sort of Socio-Religio-Scholarly war between the two parties.

An instance of their decline can be found in the *Mālatīmādhava* of Bhavabhūti. The Buddhists lost their courage and scholarly strength and could not stand the criticisms of Udyotakara, Kumārila, Vācaspati Mishra I, Maṇḍana Mishra, Bhavabhūti, the great Udayanācārya

and several others in the North and those of the .great Śaṅkarācārya in the South. These veteran savants refuted the *Tarkas* of the Buddhists and finally re-established the supremacy of *Varṇāśramadharma* and Bhāratīya thoughts.

The Buddhists from the very beginning tried to live as a separate and independent class with reactionary sectarian ideas attacking *Varṇāśramadharma*, Vedic ideals and thoughts. They always cherished the idea of belonging to a separate culture and even civilization. They did not like those who followed the *Varṇāśramadharma*. So the Bhāratīyas, who had tolerated all sorts of people, if only the latter had desired to live as belonging to one group, even with their natural tolerance could not allow the sectarian and reactionary group of the Buddhists in the country.

Besides, on the political side there was the Brāhmanic revival. There were the Śuṅgas headed by Puṣyamitra, Kāṇvas and even the Śātavāhanas under whom the Vedic traditions again came to be revived with greater vigour. The Huṇa king Mihirakula of the 5th century A. C. helped the Brāhmaṇic culture and traditions in various ways against the Buddhists. The Buddhists were tortured and persecuted in their turn.

The Buddhists openly denied and also criticised the existence of God (Vide *Bodhicaryāvatāra* and *Pañjikā* on it, pp. 549-59). It was because of this that the great Maithila scholar Udayanācārya wrote his famous work, the *Nyāya-Kusumāñjali* proving the existence of God and criticised vigorously the views of the Buddhists in his *Ātmatattvaviveka*, also known as *Bauddhādhikkāra* and *Bauddhādhikāra*. The famous lines of Udayanācārya addressed to Lord Jagannātha—

ऐश्वर्यमदमत्तोऽसि मामवज्ञाय वर्त्तसे । पुनर्बौद्धे समायाते मदधीना तव स्थितिः ॥

also support the above.

The Buddhists encouraged the Tāntric cult and under its garb spread various types of corruptions amongst people.

This was realised by the non-Buddhists who turned against them and tried to drive them away from the country.

It is a fact that Buddhism flourished on the very borders of Mithilā. It is a well-known fact that the Maithilas were great Vedic scholars who followed the Vedic culture and traditions very rigidly. When the Buddhists entered into the land of Mithilā and began to take anti-Vedic steps, attacking Veda, Vedic culture and also preaching their teachings through a non-Sanskrit language, the Maithilas could not tolerate their behaviour and met them on public platforms to refute the Buddhist arguments and re-establish the Vedic traditions. It was the time when Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā came into the field. The land of Mithilā, the home of Janaka and Yājñavalkya and many other Vedic ṛṣis, which was once renowned for Ādhyātmic pursuits (Vide *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*) was shocked at the non-Vedic attitude of these people. The Maithila scholars first tried to persuade them to be faithful to their old fold, but when they found that the Buddhists were deadly against the Vedic traditions and teachings, then they left all their own Ādhyātmic pursuits and tried to drive the Buddhistic thoughts away not only from Mithilā and her borders but even from India through reasoning and writing books after books and criticising their views.

It is also an admitted fact that the Buddhist monasteries and vihāras became very rich through donations in various forms from different sources. This led the Buddhists to love riches more than their own old high teachings and discipline of body and mind. They could not check themselves against worldly temptations which ultimately resulted in their own downfall and also in their being attacked by foreigners.

Lastly, the Muslims who were very eager to collect all the wealth of India by all possible means, did not spare these vihāras and monasteries. They plundered and burnt

the vihāras which made the Buddhists homeless. All this combined together to drive away the anti-Vedic traditions from the country, which led to the final decline of Buddhism in India.

It was a very serious blunder on the part of the Buddhists to think of themselves as followers of an independent culture, religion and philosophy. In fact, there is only one religion, only one culture and only one philosophy in India. Great saints and scholars with their independent views have flourished from time to time and have contributed to the thoughts of India. They may be the Buddha, or Śaṅkara, or Kumarila, or Vācaspati, or Udayana, or any one else, all were Indian savants and scholars and reformers. They have together enriched Indian thought and culture.

Now to sum up the above I wish to repeat that (1) teachings delivered to non-qualified persons, (2) admission to the Order not being restricted, (3) non-recording of the teachings, (4) dissatisfaction and split amongst the members of the Order, (5) false impression of their belonging to an independent culture and thus keeping themselves aloof from the society, (6) the reactionary attitude of the members of the Order, (7) their hatred towards the three main pillars of the Bhāratīya culture and civilization, namelv, Veda, Varṇāśramadharma and Sanskrit language, (8) introduction of Pāli in place of Sanskrit, (9) directly denying and criticising the existence of God, (10) love for the possession of power and worldly riches, (11) spreading of corruption and doing mischief under the garb of Tāntric Siddhis, and above all (12) doing these acts on the very borders of Mithilā, an ancient centre of Vedic culture and civilization and traditional scholarship and lastly, (13) the mischief of the invaders are some of the main features which led to the decline of Buddhism in India and subsequently, leaving of the country by the Buddhists.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

A HISTORY OF THE SAMSKṚITA LITERATURE—By V. Varadachari, M. A., Lecturer in Sanskrit, Loyala College, Madras, pages vii and 302. 1952, Ram Narain Lal & Sons, Allahabad. Price Rs. 5.

This is a history of Sanskrit literature from the earliest times up to the last century. It gives a clear and accurate account of what one would find in the larger volumes of Winternitz, Macdonell and Keith. A special feature is the laying stress of the traditional point of view which does not receive adequate recognition elsewhere. This is recommended as a B. A. class text book in all universities when students will be more benefitted by such smaller books.

DEVAKERALAM—(Candrakalānāḍī)—By Acyuta, Critically edited with introduction by T. S. Ranganatha Josyar. General Editor, T. Chandrasekharan, M. A., L. T., Curator, Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras. 1952. pages xiii and 359. Price Rs. 11-4-0.

The number of works in Jyotiṣa still unpublished is legion and we welcome this publication by the Madras Government. The book contains a good deal of information about many important aspects of Jyotiṣa. The introduction in English by the curator and General Editor gives an account of the steps taken by the Madras Government in getting the several manuscripts printed. There should really be a Manuscripts' collection and printing drive which evidently is talked about everywhere but hardly put

into practice. Film-Photography is only a means of saving the contents of manuscripts from complete destruction. It is the printing of these alone which amounts to resuscitation of culture. The publishers and the editor both deserve every encouragement for such undertakings.

THE SAUGAR UNIVERSITY JOURNAL—1951-1952. Editor, Dr. R. P. Tripathi, D. Sc. (Lond.) Vice-Chancellor, Saugar University, Saugor, pages ii and 222. Published by the Registrar, Saugar University, M. P.

This journal is the first instalment of research articles published by the Saugar University, founded by the late Sir Hari Singh Gour in 1946 The place of honour is given to the lectures on '*Indian Culture*' by R. C. Majumdar, Principal, College of Indology, Banaras Hindu University the first in the series of lectures named after the founder. We may formulate the three laws of the dynamics of culture as follows:—(1) Regarding the past, Indian Culture is shown to have moved and progressed. It is dynamic. A reversion to the past in its entirety is as impossible as it would be futile. (2) The future could not be shaped in any way but should be dwelt on the foundations of the present inherited from the past. (3) The present culture of India is not a single homogenous whole. There is diversity of culture. Especially, two types of culture are seen —the Hindu and the Muslim. Some scholars are of the view that the present culture may be styled as 'Indian Culture' and that it is a composite mixture of Hindu and Muslim cultures. Dr. Majumdar has taken great pains to prove as a historical fact that, though no doubt the two cultures acted and re-acted on each other, the two should be even now regarded as distinct. He utters the timely warning that the historian "cannot trim his sails according to prevailing political winds, but has to steer his course straight to the

goal—which is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth". This recognition of the diversity of Indian Culture would be the only means of the promotion of the best elements in each and thereby building a strong united India.

There are 20 other articles relating to Science, Economics and Literature which all maintain the University standard of efficiency in research. The research scholar and student would welcome this publication. The price of the journal is not stated.

APTE'S STUDENT'S GUIDE TO SANSKRIT COMPOSITION. Translated into Hindi by Ram Krishna Shukla, M. A., B. T., published by Ram Narain Lal & Sons Booksellers and Publishers, Allahabad, 1951. Price Rs. 4.

With the introduction of vernacular as the medium of instruction in the schools and colleges it has become necessary to have such classic text-books in Sanskrit as the one under review translated into vernacular. We are glad to note that the publishers have undertaken this task in right earnest. They have so far published some other such books but this is perhaps their best performance. Some jolts and jerks are inherent in a first attempt of this kind but we hope the translator will be able to achieve greater smoothness, fluency and intelligibility in the next edition. Since the intended readers of this text-book will be young and immature, it is very important to trim the ragged corners and make the vernacular book like an original composition than a mere literal, word for word translation. We recommend this work whole-heartedly to all those who have undertaken to teach Sanskrit composition in the schools and colleges in Hindi.

HASTINĀPURA. By Amar Chand, Published by Jain Cultural Research Society, Banaras Hindu University, Banaras. 1952. Pp. 64. Price Rs. 2/8.

This is a small introduction to the ancient city of Hastinapur which has been the site of recent excavations by the Archaeological Department of the Government of India. Dr. Rajbali Pandey of the Banaras Hindu University says that the work "is systematic, scholarly and indicative of a great promise." From what the author tells us of the Hastinapur excavations it would appear that much cannot be hoped from them at the present sites. The booklet is much too highly priced for its worth and utility.

A KEY TO TRUE HAPPINESS. By Brahmachari Sital Prasadji, Published by Shree Digambar Jains Committee, Mahavir Park Road, Jaipur, Pages 133. Price Re. 1.

A popular exposition of Jain religious ideas by a modern Jain School. The Managing Committee of Shree Digambar Jain Atishaya Kshetra Shree Mahaviraji, Mahavir Park Road, Jaipur has been doing commendable work and it is the third book in their series called Shree Mahavira Granthamala.

EARLY GAṄGĀS OF TALAKĀD. By Śrīkaṇṭha Śāstrī. To be had of: R. Hari Rao, 10–11 Cenotaph Road, Bangalore —2. Pages 57. Price Rs. 2/8 as. or 5 Shillings. 1952.

This is a monograph on the History of South India, particularly of Karṇaṭaka. It attempts to reconstruct the the history of the Gaṅga dynasty from about c. 300 A. D. to c. 600 A. D. in the light of all the Gaṅga records published till now with special reference to the Hebbaṭa grant of Durvinīta and the chronology of the most impor-

tant dynasties of India during this period. It gives all this in the form of a translation and notes on the text of Hebbaṭa grant of Durvinīta Gaṅgā, which is also quoted in Roman script.

SIR WILLIAM JONES, ORIENTALIST. An Annotated Bibliography of His works. By Garland H. Cannon. Published by the University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu 14, Hawaii, U. S. A., Pages 88. Price : Not mentioned. 1952.

As the title indicates, it is a comprehensive survey of the writings of Sir William Jones (1746–94) the Pioneer English Orientalist. In 1946 the *bicentennial* of Jones's birth was commemorated with celebrations and important Publications in London, Oxford, and Calcutta. He was the pioneer in interpreting the Orient to the West. He started the task of uniting the East and the West. This is the first comprehensive bibliography of his works. All the information is divided into three headings : *Poet and Literary Scholar* (up to 1773) ; *Lawyer pre-India Period* (1773–1785) ; and *India Period* (1783–1794). Each item is commented upon in detail on its style and sources. On the whole, it is a valuable publication and will be very useful to all reference libraries and to scholars interested in 18th century English literature and comparative Anglo-Oriental Studies. The design and printing of the book are commendable.

JOURNAL

OF THE

GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Vol. IX] FEB.—MAY—AUGUST 1952 [Parts 2, 3, 4

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE WORKS ON VEDĀNTA BY GAṄGĀDHARA SARASVATĪ AND HIS DISCIPLE ĀNANDABODHENDRA SARASVATĪ

By P. K. GODE

AUFRECHT records the following MSS of the works of Gaṅgādhara Sarasavtī :

Cata. Catalogorum, Part I, p. 139—

"गंगाधर यति or भिक्षु or सरस्वती or गंगाधरेन्द्रयति, pupil of Rāmacandra Sarasvatī, *praśiṣya* of Sarvajña Sarasvatī :

—चन्द्रिकोद्गार[1] वेदान्तसिद्धान्तचन्द्रिकाटीका

—प्रणवकल्पप्रकाश[2] L 2291

—वेदान्तसिद्धान्तसूक्तिमंजरी and its प्रकाश[3] I O. 1597. Hall p. 153. L. 524. K. 136. Oudh 1877, 44 (comm.)

—साम्राज्यसिद्धि and Commentary B. 4. 84 (मोक्षसाम्राज्यसिद्धि) Bh. K. 31

—सिद्धान्तबिन्दुशीकर सिद्धान्तलेशटीका Oudh 1876. 24

—सिद्धान्तलेशसंग्रह and comm. B. 4. 106.

—स्वाराज्यसिद्धि and comm. कैवल्यकल्पद्रुम (composed in 1827)

---

1 The Govt. MSS Library at B. O. R. Institute possesses a MS of चन्द्रिकोद्गार (*No.* 376 *of A.* 1881-82).

2 See MS *No.* 114 *of* 1899-1915 in the Govt. MSS Library (प्रणवकल्पप्रकाश by गंगाधर सरस्वती).

3 See MS *No.* 383 *of* 1895-1902 (वेदान्तसिद्धान्तसूक्तिमंजरी with प्रकाश by गंगाधर सरस्वती—MS dated *Saṁvat* 1892=A. D. 1836.

In the above extract Aufrecht states that Gaṅgādhara Sarasvatī (=*GS*) composed his स्वाराज्यसिद्धि and commentary in *A. D.* 1827. Let us now see if this date is correct.

Hall in his *Bibliography* (Calcutta, 1859, p. 104) describes a MS of कैवल्यकल्पद्रुम by GS and states that it was "composed in the *Śaka year* 1748".

Eggeling describes the following Mss of the स्वाराज्यसिद्धि and commentary by *GS* on pages 752—753 of Part IV of *India Office MSS Catalogue*, 1894 :

(1) *No.* 2,360—"Composed in 1692 A. D." The following Stanza at the end of the work records the date of composition of the work :

"वस्वब्धिमुन्यवनिमान शके वृषाख्य-
वर्षस्य माघसितवाक्पतियुक्तषष्ठ्यां।
गंगाधरेन्द्रयतिना शिवयोः पदाब्जे
भक्त्यार्पिता (r.° पिता)· सुकृतिरस्तु सतां शिवाय।"

Eggeling observes on the above Stanza and the date recorded in the above Stanza as follows :—

"The above Śaka date (वसु, अब्धि, मुनि, अवनि) is correct for *Vikrama* 1748 (expired), the date, according to Prof. Kielhorn, corresponding to *Thursday*, *14th January* 1692 *A. D.*"[4]

(2) *No.* 2361—The same treatise here called "आत्मसाम्राज्यसिद्धि" or simply "साम्राज्यसिद्धि" (in margin) with the commentary कैवल्यकल्पद्रुम.

Eggeling states that the MS is written "in 1782 A.D." but the Colophon records the date of copy as "संवत् १८३१" which is equal to *A. D.* 1775.

---

[4] See *Indian Ephemeris* by Pillai, Madras, 1922, Vol. VI, p. 186. The name of the Śaka for Vikrama 1748 is "Angiras" and not वृष as stated in the above stanza ("वृषाख्यवर्षस्य").

The date of composition as read by Kielhorn viz. *A. D.* 1692[5] corresponding to *Vikrama Saṁvat* 1748 appears to be correct. We cannot take *Śaka* 1748 to mean a *Śaka* year proper, which gives us the date *A. D.* 1826 as the India Office MS of the *Svārājyasiddhi* is dated *Saṁvat* 1831 = A. D. 1775. There can be no MSS of a work written prior to the date of its composition. If the work was really composed in A. D. 1826, how can we have a MS of it written in A. D. 1775 ?

---

[5] Gaṅgādhara Sarasvatī is later than Appaya Dīkṣita (A. D. 1520-1592—*J. O. R. Madras*, III, p. 148) the author of सिद्धांतलेश on which he wrote a Commentary. Gaṅgādhara mentions सिद्धांतलेश in his वेदांतसिद्धांतसूक्तिमंजरी as will be seen from the following list of references to works and authors mentioned by Gaṅgādhara :

MS No. 383 of 1895-1902 (B. O. R. Institute) वेदांतसिद्धांतसूक्ति-मंजरी with Comm. प्रकाश by Gaṅgādhara himself :

Text—सिद्धांतलेश—fol. 1. ...

प्रकटार्थकृतः—2, 4
संक्षेपशारीरककृतः—2, 4, 5, 25
आगमाचार्य—3
वाचस्पतिमते—4
तत्वविवेके—5
गौडपादीये—5
दृग्दृश्यविवेक—5
भारतीतीर्थमते—7
तत्वशुद्धिकृतः—8, 12 (तत्वशुद्धौ)
वाचस्पतिमते—8
न्यायचंद्रिका—10
तत्वदीपे—11
अद्वैतविद्याचार्याः—12, 18, 22, 29, 32
नृसिंहभट्टोपाध्यायः—14
न्यायसुधाकृतः—16
संक्षेपाचार्यदर्शनं—16
भामतीकृतः—16
विवरणवार्तिके—17
विवरणानुगाः—2, 3, 5, 8 (विवरणे)
वार्त्तिकवेदिनः—2, 26 (वार्त्तिकोक्तेः)
कौमुदीकृतः—3, 8, 12 (कौमुद्याम्)
आचार्योक्तिः—19, आचार्याः 28, 29
चित्सुखाचार्ययोगिनः—21
चित्सुखदर्शने—32
रामाद्वयाचार्य—21
ब्रह्मसिद्धिकृताम्—31
आनंदबोधाचार्यः—32

References in the प्रकाश :

संक्षेपशारीरकाचार्यमते—3
मुक्तावलीकृतः—6
कल्पतरूक्ति—7, 25, 28
शास्त्रदर्पणे—21
विवरणाचार्य—28
जैमिनि—34
चरकादिग्रंथ—3
आगमाचार्य—3

On the basis of the data recorded so far I am inclined to assign Gaṅgādhara Sarasvatī to the period, *C. A. D.* 1650-1725.

Gaṅgādhara Sarasvatī had a disciple of the name Ānandabodhendra Sarasvatī, who wrote a commentary on the *Yogavāśiṣṭha* called the *Vāsiṣṭhatātparya-Prakāśa*. The India Office Library MS No. 305 of this commentary is dated *Saṁvat* 1851=*A. D.* 1795 (see p. 776 of Part IV of *I. O. Catalogue*, by Eggeling, 1894). Bühler records a MS of this commentary on pages 84-85 of Fascicule IV of his *Catalogue of MSS in Gujarat etc.*, 1873. This MS is dated "१६६२" which, if taken as a Śaka year, would give us the date " *A. D.* 1740 ". If this year " १६६२ " is taken to be a Vikrama year it will give us the date " *A. D.* 1606 ."

If Gaṅgādhara Sarasvatī wrote a work in A. D. 1692 (*Svārājyasiddhi*) it is impossible to believe that his disciple Ānandabodhendra wrote a work earlier than A. D. 1606. I am, therefore, inclined to believe that the date " १६६२ " given by Bühler belongs to the Śaka era and that it is equal to *A. D.* 1740. The date of Ānandabodhendra's *Vāṣiṣṭha-tātparya-Prakāśa* is, therefore, *earlier than A. D.* 1740. Ānandabodhendra mentions and quotes from his guru's *Svārājysiddhi* as follows on page 626 of the edition of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* with the *Prakāśa* commentary, Vol. I, 1937, N. S. Press, Bombay :—

"तथाचोक्तं स्वाराज्यसिद्धौ—

"अपि भूपरमाणुभूरिसंख्येष्वपयातेषु चतुर्मुखेष्वलब्धात् ।
अपदुःखनिरन्तसौख्यसिन्धोर्न च लाभोऽस्ति परो निजात्मलाभात् ॥" इति ।"

I have identified the above verse in a MS of the *Svārājyasiddhi* (No. 377 of A. 1881-82) at the B. O. R. Institute, on folios 14-15 where it reads as follows :

"अपि भूपरमाणुभूरिसंख्येष्वपयातेषु चतुर्मुखेष्वलब्धात् । अपशोकनिरंतर-सौख्यसिन्धोर्न च लाभोऽस्ति परोनिजात्मलाभात् ।"

In another MS of the *Svārājyasiddhi No.* 677 of 1887-91, folio 13, the text of the above verse is exactly identical with that given in the printed edition of the *Prakāśa* referred to above.

As the *Prakāśa* commentary quotes from and mentions *Svārājyasiddhi* composed in A. D. 1692 it is later than A. D. 1692 but earlier than A. D. 1740, which is the date of its MS recorded by Bühler as I have pointed out already. In view of this evidence the literary activity of Ānandabodhendra may be assigned to the period, *A. D.* 1692-1750 tentatively.

At the end of the text of the *Prakāśa* commentary as printed in the N. S. Press edition 1937, Vol. II, p. 1572, there are five verses, of which No. 4 reads as follows :

"ऋतुरसतुरगमह्ीं १७६६ शकविकारिशुभवत्सरस्य शिशिरर्तोः ।
फाल्गुनसितसप्तम्यां भृगुरौहिणवृषभलग्नके सिद्धम् ॥४॥"

The chronogram in this verse gives the following particulars :

year—Śaka 1766 of the name विकारि

Month—*Phālguna*

Tithi—7,

Pakṣa—*Śukla*

Day—*Bhṛgu* (Friday)

If the year " 1766 " in the above verse is taken to be a Vikrama year we get the following date which possesses all the particulars of the date mentioned in the verse :—

" *Friday*, 24*th February*, 1710 ". The name of the *Vikrama year* 1766 is " *Vikārin* " (see pp. 221-222 of *Indian Ephemeris* by Pillai, Vol. VI, 1922).

Possibly the date " *Friday*, 24*th February* 1710 " is the date of the completion of the commentary by Ānandabodhendra.

In Stein's *Catalogue of Jammu and Kashmir MSS*, p. 124 the following dated MSS of the *Prakāśa* commentary are recorded :—

No. 2005-11—dated (saṁvat) 1919 (=A. D. 1863) "टीकाविरचनकालः शके १७६६"

No. 2126-2129—dated (Saṁvat) 1825 (=A. D. 1769)

The chronological data about Gaṅgādhara Sarasvatī (GS) and his disciple Ānandabodhendra (AB) may now be tabulated as follows :—

Date A. D.	Particulars GS=Gaṅgādhara Sarasvatī AB=Ānandabodhendra
1692	Date of *Svārājya Siddhi* of *GS*.
1710	Date of composition of the *Prakāśa* commentary by *AB* on the *Yogāvāsiṣṭha*.
1740	Date of a MS of *Prakāśa* comm. of *AB* recorded by Bühler.
1769	Date of a Jammu MS of the *Prakāśa* by *AB*.
1775	Date of India Office MS of *Sāmrājyasiddhi* or *Svārājyasiddhi* of *GS*.
1795	Date of a MS of the *Prakāśa* comm. of *AB* in the India Office Library.
1836	Date of the MS of the *Prakāśa* commentary of *AB*—No. 383 of 1895-1902 (B. O. R. Institute).
1842	Date of a MS of *Prakāśa* comm. in U. S. A. (No. 4224 of Poleman's *Cata*. 1938).
1863	Date of a MS of the *Prakāśa* comm. of *AB* at Jammu.

It will be seen from the above table that the literary activity of Gaṅgādhara Sarasvatī and his disciple Ānandabodhendra lies *between C. A. D.* 1650 *and* 1750.

BHARTṚHARI'S DATE

By SADHU RAM

1. *I-tsing's Record*:

IN the year 1880 Prof. Max Müller wrote an article on the *Kāśikā-vṛtti*, a commentary on Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* by Jayāditya and Vāmana. In that article he used the evidence of I-tsing, a Chinese pilgrim in India. The translation of the most important passages in that record was made for him by one of his Japanese pupils, K. Kasawara, who informed him that it "was written by I-tsing ......, who left Kwangchau, in China, in the 11th lunar month of the year 671 A. D., arrived at Tamralipti, in India, after a long voyage, in the second month of 673, and started from that place for Nalanda in the fifth month of the same year."[1]

Later on Prof. J. Takakusu translated the record of I-tsing into English and wrote the following note on its date :—

"I-tsing sent his record through the Venerable Tatsin on the 15th day of the 5th month in the 3rd year of the Tienshou period, i.e., A. D. 692. His composition must be earlier than this, but must be later than (the 11th month of) A. D. 691, for he says in chap. xxviii that he spent more than twenty years since his departure from home in (the 11th month of) A. D. 671."[2]

We have, however, no means or full materials to check and verify the calculations and conversion of Chinese dates into the Christian era. In view of the fact that a good deal of the history of Bhāratavarṣa has been distorted

---

1 "*India, What can it teach us*?" pp. 342-343, Oxford 1882.

2 "*A Record of Buddhist Religion*" by I-tsing, translated by J. Takakusu, foot-note 4 on p. 176, Oxford 1896.

by wrong calculations of several indigenous eras,[3] a fresh scrutiny of the Chinese dates also becomes necessary. Their re-calculations may repay the labour of scholars and help in the true re-construction of history.

2. *Important Statements of I-tsing regarding Bhartṛhari* :

Bhartṛhari's name and works have been noticed by I-tsing and he makes the following important statements about him[4] :—

(a) That he wrote a *Bhartṛśāstra* or a commentary on the *Chūrṇī*, the *Vākya-discourse*, and the *Pei-na*[5].

(b) That he was a contemporary of Dharmapāla who wrote a commentary on his *Pei-na*.

(c) That he died 40 years before his time, and

(d) That he turned a Buddhist and wavered seven times between the monastery and the world.

---

[3] The current Śaka-Śālivāhana era is not the only Śaka era as is generally supposed by scholars. *Śaka-nṛpa-kālātīta-saṁvatsara* is an entirely different era. This becomes clear from the fact that from time to time different Śaka eras had been adjusted by computation in order to remove their discrepancies (*vide* hints to this fact in "*Śakas in India*" by Satyaśrava, pp. 39, 45, 52, etc., and "*Bhāratavarṣa kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*" in Hindi by Bhagavad Datta, Vol. I, pp. 119-120.

[4] "*A Record of Buddhist Religion*" *op. cit.* pp. 179-180.

[5] They are the lost *Tripadī* commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali, the *Vākyapadīya* and the *Prakīrṇa* chapter of *Vakyapadīya*. The *Pei-na* was identified with *Prakīrṇa* by Prof. F. Keilhorn in his article in "*Indian Antiquary*", Vol. XII, pp. 226-227. From I-tsing's reference to *Pei-na* (or *Prakīrṇa*) as a separate work, it may be assumed that the tradition of regarding the 3rd chapter of the *Vākyapadīya* to be an independent work had come into vogue by his time. This tradition is later borne out by Helārāja, who in his commentary on the *Prakīrṇa kāṇḍa* always refers to his commentary on the earlier two *kāṇḍas* as being on the *Vākyapadīya* (*e.g.*, com. on 3. 154 has '*iti nirṇītaṁ Vākyapadīye*'). Further, he calls his commentary on the *Vākyapadīya* as *Sabda-prabhā* as distinguished from *Prakīrṇa prakāśa* (*vide* colophon of each Samuddeśa). Again, Vardhamāna, the author of *Gaṇa-ratna-mahodadhi*, clearly says : भर्तृहरिर्वाक्यपदीय-प्रकीर्णयोः कर्ता महाभाष्य-त्रिपाद्या व्याख्याता च। Pt. Charu Deva in his edition of the *Vākyapadīya* (Lahore, 1934) notes that in several Mss. the following *Puṣpikā* is seen at the end of the 2nd *kāṇḍa* : इति भगवद्भर्तृहरिकृते वाक्यपदीये द्वितीयं काण्डम्। समाप्ता वाक्यपदीयकारिका। (vide उपोद्घात, p. 8)

3. *The Generally Accepted Date* :

On the strength of the statement (c) above, the date of Bhartṛhari's death has been fixed at 650-651 A. D. This date has continued to be accepted since the time of Max Müller[6], and except for a few notable scholars nobody has questioned it.

4. *Objections to this Date* :

(A) *Telang's Contention* (1893)—

Justice K. T. Telang contended that since there was no Buddhistic flavour about the *Śatakas*, the grammarian Bhartṛhari who wrote them, could not have been a Buddhist. Therefore, I-tsing's statement about his date, like his other statement, is not reliable[7].

(B) *Bhagavad Datta's Doubts* (1927 & 1931)—

Quoting *kārikās* and their portions (54-59) from the 2nd *kāṇḍa* of the *Vākyapadīya* Pt. Bhagavad Datta suspected a close relationship between Vasurāta, Bhartṛhari and Śaśāṅka (=Candragomin) and further, on the evidence of *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, taking Candragomin to be a contemporary of King Abhimanyu I of Kashmir, whom Sir Aurel Stein placed in the 4th-5th century A. D., he contended that the evidence of I-tsing would have to be rejected as incorrect and Bhartṛhari pushed back[8]. In 1931 he again drew attention to the same inaccuracy of I-tsing by referring to the *kārikās* of Bhartṛhari quoted by Skanda in his commentary on the *Nirukta* (1.2.5.16)[9].

---

[6] See Keilhorn's article in "*Indian Antiquary*", Vol. XIII, p. 226; Macdonell's "*Hist. of Skt. Lit.*", p. 340; A. B. Keith's "*Classical Skt. Lit.*", p. 111, Calcutta, 1947, and "*A Hist. of Skt. Lit.*", p. 429 ; S. K. Belvalkar's "*Systems of Skt. Grammar*", p. 40; V. A. Ramaswami's "*Tattvabindu*", Introd. p. 28, 1936, etc.

[7] Introduction to "*Nīti Śataka* and *Vairāgya Śataka*", Bom. Skt. Series, 1893.

[8] "*Vaidika Vāṅmaya kā Itihāsa*", Vol. II, p. 259, 1927.

[9] "*Vaidika Vāṅmaya kā Itihāsa*", Vol. II Part 2, p. 230, 1931.

(C) *Bruno Liebich's Opinion* (1930):

In his introduction to *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī* Prof. Bruno Liebich found it difficult to believe that the fame of Bhartṛhari could have spread far in India by the time I-tsing came here in 671. From this consideration he was inclined to place him at least two centuries anterior to the 7th century.

(D) *Kunhanraja's Arguments* (1936, 1940 & 1942):

The following are the arguments of Dr. Kunhanraja :—

(a) "From the mention of Vasurāta as the teacher of Bhartṛhari found in the commentary of Puṇyarāja to stanzas 486 and 489 in *Kāṇḍa* II, the date of Bhartṛhari has to be fixed in the 5th century. It is true that Bhartṛhari himself does not say that Vasurāta was his teacher. He mentions only Candra by name. He says: '*Candrācāryādibhiḥ punaḥ*' (II. 498). Paramārtha speaks of a Vasurāta in the time of Bālāditya in the Biography of Subandhu. The date of Bhartṛhari, if he is a disciple of Vasurāta, must be in the fifth century."[10]

(b) Dismissing Bruno Liebich's contention with the argument that scholars and students could easily carry the fame of learned men from place to place when they made frequent pilgrimages to different seats of learning in search of knowledge, Dr. Kunhanraja found the difficulty elsewhere in accepting the 7th century date. He identified Viṣṇugupta, the patron of Vṛṣabhadeva, a commentator of Bhartṛhari, with the Gupta Emperor of that name who reigned in A. D. 700. Now, Vṛṣabhadeva says that many *Ācāryas* have already written commentaries

[10] Dr. Kunhanraja takes the force out of his arguments by offering two surmises that either the statement of Puṇyarāja is wrong, or there may have been two Vasurātas. We, however, do not agree with either of the surmises, for the statement of Puṇyarāja is now corroborated by the evidence of the Jain writer Siṁhasūri Gaṇī (See Iyengar's findings below).

on the *Vākyapadīya*[11]. A few centuries, therefore, must have intervened between Bhartṛhari and Vṛṣabhadeva. Dr. Kunhanaraja, therefore, supports the possibility of assigning the 5th century to Bhartṛhari. In corroboration of this date he refers to the same quotations from the *Vākyapadīya* in Skanda-Maheśvara's commentary on *Nirukta* as were traced by Pt. Bhagvad Datta and to those in the *Śatapatha-Bhāṣya* of Harisvāmī[12].

(c) Again, Kunhanraja has placed Kumārila in the middle of the 6th century (i.e., circa A.D. 550) on the basis of the citation of the 12th *Kārikā* of the *Ślokavārtika* by Viśvarūpa (A. D. 600), author of the *Bāla-krīḍā* commentary on the *Yājñavalkya-smṛti*. Viśvarūpa was a contemporary of King Pratāpaśīla who, according to Bāṇa, was no other than King Prabhākaravardhana[13]. Dr. Kunhanraja, therefore, says that Bhartṛhari must be "pushed back by about two centuries",[14] i. e. to near about A. D. 350.

(d) Further, Dr. Kunhanraja wrote in 1942: "The quotations from Kumārila's works found in Maheśvara's *Nirukta* commentary form a strong evidence for pushing the dates of Bhartṛhari and Kumārila back by a few centuries, perhaps by two or two and a half."[15]

(E) *Yudhiṣṭhira's Arguments* (Sam. 2007 or A.D. 1950):

In the year 1950 Pt. Yudhiṣṭhira brought out his work of great labour and erudition, namely, "*Saṁskṛta Vyākaraṇa Śāstra kā Itihāsa*" in Hindi. In addition to some of the

---

11 "यद्यपि टीका बह्वयः पूर्वाचार्यैः सुनिर्मला रचिताः"।

12 "*I-tsing and Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadīya*" in Dr. Krishnaswami Aiyangar's Commemoration Volume, pp. 295-297, 1936. Harisvāmī has recorded his own date as Kali Saṁvat 3740 or Vikrama 695 (A. D. 638).

13 *Harṣacaritam*, Bom. Skt. Series, p. 174.

14 Preface to *Ślokavārtika-vyākhyā* of Bhaṭṭa Umveka, Madras University publication, 1940, pp. xvi-xvii.

15 "Descriptive Catal. of Skt. Mss." Adyar, Vol. I. Intro. p. xxiii.

aforesaid references which he has collected at one place, Yudhiṣṭhira has advanced the following arguments for pushing back the date of Bhartṛhari[16] :—

(a) According to Sāyaṇa, the author of *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti*, Vāmana in his *Kāśikā-vṛtti* on Pāṇ. VII.iv.93 refutes the view of Durgasiṁha. Now, Durgasiṁha quotes *Vākyapadīya* (3.1) in his *Kātantra-vṛtti* (1.1.9). Bhartṛhari, therefore, was not only earlier to *Kāśikā*, which according to Yudhiṣṭhira was written between Sam. 680-701 (A. D. 623-644)[17], but also to Durgasiṁha, the predecessor of Vāmana.

(b) Harisvāmī quotes from Bhartṛhari as well as from Prabhākara[18]. Prabhākara is believed to be the disciple of Kumārila who quotes from the *Vākyapadīya* in his *Tantra-vārtika*. From this he concludes that Prabhākara was a predecessor of Harisvāmī. (Kumārila, a predecessor of Prabhākara; and Bhartṛhari that of Kumārila.) This increases the interval between Harisvāmī and Bhartṛhari by at least two generations. At the end of the 1st *Kāṇḍa* of his *Śatapatha-vyākhyā*, Harisvāmī records his own date of writing as Kali Saṁ. 3740=Vik. 695=A. D. 638.

---

[16] "*Saṁskrita Vyākaraṇa Śāstra kā Itihāsa*", pp. 258-262.

[17] This date, however, is very uncertain. In a story told in the Kannaḍa *Pañcatantra* (II. 27) of some Durgasiṁha (11th cent. A. D.), which is based on the Sanskrit work of Vasubhāgabhaṭṭa, Vāmana and Jayāditya are stated to have been in the court of a Gupta king Vikramāditya Sāhasāṅka of Ujjayini (vide "*Proceedings of the All India Oriental Conference*", Mysore, Dec. 1935, p. 568, printed in 1937). Again, I. S. Pawate, in the introduction of his "*The Structure of the Aṣṭādhyāyī*" has tried to establish that Jinendra was the author of the *Jainendra Vyākaraṇa*, who was identical with Jinendrabuddhi, the author of the *Nyāsa* which is the earliest extant commentary on the *Kāśikā*. He concludes by saying, "If the author of the *Nyāsa* lived about 450 A.D., the *Kāśikā* which was an old work at the time of the author of the *Nyāsa* must go back to somewhere about the beginning of the Christian era."

[18] *Viz*., "अयवा सूत्राणि यथा विद्युद्दंश इति प्रभाकराः—अपः प्रणीयतीति यथा" (Manuscript, p. 5).

(c) Yudhiṣṭhira has traced the following two *kārikās* of the *Vākyapadīya* in the commentary of Indu, a direct disciple of *Vāgbhaṭa* (A. D. 400)[19], on *Uttaratantra*, chapter 50 :—

संसर्गो विप्रयोगश्च साहचर्यं विरोधिता ।
अर्थः प्रकरणं लिङ्गं शब्दस्यान्यस्य सन्निधिः ॥
सामर्थ्यमौचितिर्देशः कालो व्यक्तिः स्वरादयः ।
शब्दार्थस्यानवच्छेदे विशेषस्मृतिहेतवः ॥

The first of these *kārikās* is found in the Kāshi edition of the *Vākyapadīya* (II. 317), but the second is omitted from the text, probably by mistake.[20] For, it is included in Puṇyarāja's commentary on p. 216.

In this way, Pt. Yudhiṣṭhira has carried Bhartṛhari to at least A. D. 400, or a little earlier.

(F) *Iyengar's Findings* (1951) :

Quite recently, Śri H. R. Ramaswami Iyengar has written an article on " *Bhartṛhari and Diṅnāga*"[21]. In that—

(a) He has confirmed the statement of Puṇyarāja about Vasurāta being the teacher of Bhartṛhari by a new

[19] Srī Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharyya writes that Vāgbhaṭa belonged to " about 850 A. D. He cannot have flourished before 800 A. D." (*Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. xviii, No. 2, June 1947, p. 153). He admits that Jejjaṭa (875-900 A. D.), the disciple of Vāgbhaṭa, preceded Iśvarasena, the commentator of *Caraka-saṁhitā*, but does not know that this 'Iśvarasena was the teacher of Dharmakīrti who, according to Lāmā Tārānātha of Tibet and Bu-Ston's " *History of Buddhism* ", Pt. II, p. 152, was a contemporary of Kumārila. The fact that a certain Iśvarasena was the teacher of Dharmakīrti was first pointed out by M. Vidya-Bhushana in his " *A History of Indian Logic* ", p. 307, foot-notes 1, 2, (1921) and then by Stcherbatsky in his " *Buddhist Logic* ", Vol. I. p. 39 (1932) on the basis of Tibetan authorities. The identity of this Iśvarasena with Iśvarasena, the commentator of *Caraka*, was first established by Pt. Bhagavad Datta on the authority of Durveka's commentary on *Hetubinduṭīkā* of Ārcaṭa. (cf. *Bh. Bṛhad Itihāsa*, Vol. I, pp. 317, 318).

Therefore, the date of Vāgbhaṭa as proposed by D. C. Bhattacharyya is altogether unacceptable, and that of Yudhiṣṭhira is nearer the mark.

[20] We have, however, traced both these *kārikās* quoted as integral part of the *Vākyapadīya* in Siṁhasūri Gaṇi's commentary on *Dvādaśāranayacakra*, p. 147 (Chhāṇī edition) and Mallinātha's commentary on *Śiśupāla-Vadha*. 14. 80.

[21] J. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. 26, Part II, pp. 147-148, 1951.

piece of evidence. He writes: "Again, a Jain writer Siṁhasūrigaṇī, who may be assigned to the beginning of the 6th cent. A. D., in his unpublished work[22], *Nayacakraṭīkā*, a commentary on the *Nayacakra* of Mallavādī the senior, which is not now extant[23], mentions twice in his work, Vasurāta as the *Upādhyāya* of Bhartṛhari".[24]

Then referring to the contest of Vasurāta and Vasubandhu (the teacher of Diṅnāga) through the intervention of Candra, another great grammarian, he regards them as contemporaries and assigns Bhartṛhari to the 5th century A. D.

(b) This date he supports by another discovery which he made during his study of the Tibetan translation of *Pramāṇa-samuccaya* of Diṅnāga in which he has traced two *kārikās* of the *Vākyapadīya* (II. 156-157).[25]

Postulating the possibility of two alternatives that either Diṅnāga borrowed from Bhartṛhari, or both of them took the *kārikās* from quite a different work, he rejects the latter alternative, and makes Bhartṛhari the (elder) contemporary of Diṅnāga, the Buddhist logician of the 5th century.[26]

---

[22] Now published in parts, separately from two places, Baroda and Chhāṇī.

[23] It is both extant and published along with Siṁhasūri's commentary, *viz*., the Chhāṇī edition referred to in note 21.

[24] "एवं तावद् भर्तृहर्यादिदर्शनमुक्तम्। वसुरातो भर्तृहरेरुपाध्यायः।"

[25] The same *kārikās* have been independently traced to Diṅnāga's *Pramāṇa-samuccaya*, by Muni Śrī Jambūvijaya from references in Jain works (*vide* his articles on "*Mallavādī and Bhartṛhari's Date*" in *Satyaprakāśa*, Vol. 17, No. 2, Nov. 1951, pp. 26-30 and in *Buddhiprakāśa*, Vol. 98, No. 11, Nov. 1951, pp. 332-335.

[26] This date of Diṅnāga and of his preceptor Vasubandhu is open to dispute and cannot be accepted as settled—See "*Our Arguments and Findings*" (vii) below.

Prof. A. N. Pandeya, however, is of the view that these two *kārikās*, along with another one, are older than the *Vākyapadīya* and were incorporated by both Bhartṛhari and Diṅnāga in their works. He argues that they are nowhere ascribed to Bhartṛhari, but are, on the contrary, specifically attributed to Buddhist *Ācāryas* both by the Buddhist (including Dharmakīrti) as well as Jain logicians, who have cited these *kārikās*.

5. *Our Arguments and Findings*:

(i) *Evidence from Dharmakīrti*—Bhartṛhari's views have been trenchently criticised by Dharmakīrti, a contemporary of Kumārila[27] or his close successor, in his own commentary on his *Pramāṇavārtika*. While examining the *Sphoṭa*-theory in the *Anumāna-paricchedа*[28] Dharmakīrti quotes and refutes the views of several commentators[29] of Bhartṛhari, which shows that considerable time must have elapsed between him and Bhartṛhari.

(ii) *Evidence from Kumārila*—Kumārila not only quotes from Bhartṛhari[30] but also criticises several interpretations put by the followers of Bhartṛhari on his *kārikās*. For instance, he criticises ten different theories of *Vākya*, only eight of which are discussed by Bhartṛhari.[31] The two additional theories are not to be found in the extant works of Bhartṛhari. In this connection it is very significant that Mallavādī is not only aware of them but definitely attributes them to the school of grammarians. It is inconceivable that Bhartṛhari could have overlooked them, had they been known in his time. It is, therefore, reasonable to conclude that they were developed by his successors who must have flourished earlier than Kumārila and Mallavādī.

Pārthasārathi Miśra (10th cent. A. D), however, not finding the aforesaid two theories in the works of

---

[27] See foot-note 19 on p. 141.

[28] *Pramāṇavārtika with Svavṛtti*, Kitab Mahal edition, 1948. *Kārikā* 241 with *vṛtti*, pp. 434-437; and *kārikās* 250-254 and *vṛtti*, pp. 460-471.

[29] *Ibid*. *Vṛtti* on *kārikā* 423, pp. 466-470 as corrected and restored by Prof. A. N. Pandeya.

[30] Prof. Pandeya has traced over a dozen quotations from Bhartṛhari in the *Ślokavārtika* also and a few more in the *Tantravārtika*, which have not been noticed by any other scholar.

[31] Also note—(i) the comments of Kumārila on the *kārikā* "अस्त्यर्थः सर्वशब्दानाम्..", *Tantravārtika*, p. 860, Chaukhamba Skt. Series, 1898; and (ii) Kumārila's criticism of *Sphoṭavāda* in *Ślokavārtika*.

Bhartṛhari, attributes them to the imagination of Kumārila in his *Nyāyaratna-vyākhyā* on *Ślokavārtika*.[32] His explanation is incorrect both logically and historically. It is absurd to suppose that Kumārila, while pointedly refuting the views of grammarians, should indulge in the refutation of theories of his own imagination which were not upheld by the followers of Bhartṛhari. The fact appears to be that the tradition of grammarians had almost become extinct by the time of Pārthasārathi, who was removed by several centuries even from Kumārila. It is, therefore, not inconceivable that he was ignorant of the theories propounded and upheld by the immediate successors of Bhartṛhari anterior to Kumārila.

Kumārila's date is generally accepted to be circa A. D. 700, and even later. But this has been effectively refuted by Pt. Bhagavad Datta[33] and by Dr. Kunhanraja in his Preface to the *Ślokavārtika-vyākhyā*. Prof. A. N. Pandeya believes that Kumārila was a predecessor of Dharmakīrti and cannot be placed later than A.D. 550.

Bhartṛhari must, therefore, be placed considerably earlier to Kumārila. This conclusion is further supported by the fact that Kumārila never cites Bhartṛhari by name but refers to his quotations with the pronouns of uncertainty like केनचित्,[34] कश्चित्, etc., which show that to his mind the au hor seemed to belong to a great antiquity.

(iii) *Evidence from Samantabhadra*—Samantabhadra (circa 4th cent. A. D.) has parodied the *kārikās* of Bhartṛhari

---

[32] "अन्त्यपदवाक्यत्वपरैरनुपन्यस्तमपि संभवादुपन्यस्यते। तदनन्तरं हि वाक्यार्थः प्रतीयते।" Com. on *kārikā* 49 of *Vākyādhikaraṇa* of the *Ślokavārtika*, p. 86c.

[33] "*Bhāratavarṣa kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*", pp. 312-317. It should be remembered that according to Tibetan records both Kumārila and Dharmakīrti flourished in the Gupta period.

[34] *E.g.*, यदपि केनचिदुक्तम्—'तत्त्वावबोधः शब्दानाम् .... etc."—"*Tantravārtika*", p. 266, Ānandāshrama Series, 1929.

while refuting his views. This is evident from the following passage of "*Anekānta-jaya-patākā*" of Haribhadra[35] (Saṁ. 580 or A. D. 523) in which he quotes Samantabhadra[36] :—

एतेन यदुक्तम्—आह च शब्दार्थविद् "वाग्-रूपता चेदुत्क्रामेत्" इति कारिका-द्वयं तदपि प्रत्युक्तं, तुल्ययोगक्षेमत्वादिति। आह च वादिमुख्यः —

बोधात्मा चेच्छब्दस्य न स्यादन्यत्र तच्छ्रुतिः।
यद्बोद्धारं परित्यज्य न बोधोऽन्यत्र गच्छति ॥
न स्यात् प्रत्ययो लोके यः श्रोत्रा न प्रमीयते।
शब्दाभेदेन सत्येवं सर्वः स्यात् पर-चित्तवित् ॥

As explained in his own commentary, by '*Vādi-mukhyaḥ*' Haribhadra refers to Samantabhadra. These *kārikās* are evidently based on the two *kārikās* of the *Vākyapadīya* II. 125 and 124 respectively.

Prof. Pandeya believes that Samantabhadra was a predecessor of Kumārila and Dharmakīrti on the basis of his identification of the four *kārikās* of Samantabhadra in the *Ślokavārtika* on *Vana-vāda*[37].

These citations show that Bhartṛhari must have lived long before A.D. 400, round about which Samantabhadra is said to have written his work.

(iv) *Evidence of Dharmapāla*—Dharmapāla, who wrote a commentary on the *Pei-na* (*Prakīrṇa*) and the *Pada-khaṇḍa*[38]

---

[35] Gaekwad Orient. Ser., Vol. lxxxviii, edited by H. R. Kapadia, p. 375. For Haribhadra's date see "*Bhāratavarṣa kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*", p. 120.

[36] For discussions on Samantabhadra's date, see:

(i) Pt. Sakhālāla Singhāni's edition of "*Pramāṇa-mīmāṁsā*" of Hemachandra, Singhi Jain Granth Mala Series.

(ii) Pt. Dalasukha Malavāniya's edition of "*Nyāyāvatāravārtika-vṛtti*", Singhi Jain Granth Mala Series.

(iii) 2nd cent. A. D. view of Pt. Mahendra Kumāra in the *Prastāvanā* of "*Prameya-kamala-mārtaṇḍa*", pp. 30-32, Nirṇaya-sāgara Press edition, 1941.

[37] "*Ślokavārtika with Nyāyaratnākara*", *kārikās* 20-23, p. 619, Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series, 1898.

[38] "*Ālambana-parīkṣā*" of Diṅnāga, Preface by N. Aiyaswami Shastri, pp. xx-xxi, Adyar Library, 1942.

of the *Vākyapadīya*, was the preceptor of the learned *Ācārya* Śīlabhadra of Nalanda University. Śīlabhadra was 106 years old when Hiuen Tsang came to Nalanda in A.D. 635.[39] Dharmapāla died in A.D. 570.[40] Assuming this date to be correct and supposing Dharmapāla to have died at the young age of 32, we may surmise that Dharmapāla could not have written his commentaries on Bhartṛhari earlier than A.D. 558, for it is reasonable to proceed on the assumption that he must have been at least 20 years of age at the time of writing. It should be remembered that the Buddhist scholars were never favourably inclined towards the great *Ācāryas* of the *Vyākaraṇa* tradition. Dharmakīrti is extremely hard upon the entire school. Vasurāta and Vasubandhu were opponents. Bhartṛhari, too, must have been viewed with considerable hostility by the successors of Diṅnāga. If Dharmapāla decided to comment on his works in spite of Buddhistic hostility towards the grammarians, it must be presupposed that Bhartṛhari had already acquired the reputation of being an eminent authority on grammar, which fact is amply borne out by Hiuen Tsang.[41] Hence I-tsing's statement that Bhartṛhari was a Buddhist[42] and died only 40 years before his time is incorrect.[43] Bhartṛhari will have to be placed at least a century before A.D. 558, the time of Dharmapāla.

---

39 Introduction to Dharmakīrti's "*Vāda-nyāya*" by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana, p. 5, Appendix to J. B. O. R. S., Vol. XXI.

40 "*Introduction to Vaiśeshika Philosophy according to Daśapadārthī-śāstra*" by H. Ui, p. 10, 1917. This date is also questionable.

41 Vide "*Travels of Yuan Chwang*", by Thomas Watters, Vol. II, pp. 212 ff.

42 That Bhartṛhari was not a Buddhist will be discussed in one of our next papers. See Yudhiṣṭhira's "संस्कृत व्याकरणशास्त्र का इतिहास" p. 257.

43 In view of this, the remarks of Prof. Winternitz in his "*Indian Literature*", p. 29, that "the chronological data of the Chinese are, contrary to those of the Indians, wonderfully exact and reliable", become fatuous. They only tend to mislead our countrymen who have no first-hand knowledge of their ancient history and culture.

(v) *Evidence from Prabhākara*—The problem of the relative dates of Kumārila and Prabhākara has given rise to two conflicting views. One view is that Prabhākara was the disciple of Kumārila[44], while the other, led by Dr. Ganganatha Jha[45], regards him to be Kumārila's predecessor. We are inclined to agree with this latter view. In addition to the arguments advanced by Dr. Jha on the basis of the *Mīmāṁsā* tradition and *Pañjikā* of Śālikanātha, the commentator of *Bṛhatī*, we may adduce the evidence collected from Buddhist sources by Prof. Pandeya. After a painstaking and careful study of the presentation and refutation of Buddhist doctrines in the works of Prabhākara and Kumārila, Pandeya has conclusively established that Prabhākara was dealing with an earlier phase of Buddhist thought, while Kumārila was refuting its later developments. It is questionable whether Prabhākara was familiar with the views of Dharmapāla with whom Kumārila is thoroughly acquainted. From Prabhākara's citations from the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya* of Diṅnāga and Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya*[46], it is evident that he was their close successor, and, between him and Kumārila, Dharmapāla must have intervened. If, therefore, Prabhākara is to be assigned to the latter half of

---

[44] Vide Dr. Kunhanraja's Introduction to *Bṛhatī*, Part II, p. 5, Madras, 1936.

[45] "*The Prabhākara School of Pūrva-mīmāṁsā*." 1930.

[46] From *Pramāṇa-Samuccaya* :—

(a) तस्माद् विवेकशून्यमिदं वचः—"स्मृतेरुत्तरकालं च" [नह्यसावपि विभाव्यते] (*Pratyakṣa-pariccheda*, kārikā 12, quoted in *Bṛhatī*, p. 87).

(b) Fragment चर्मोपमश्चेत्सोऽनित्यः खतुल्यश्चेदसत्समः। (*Kārikā* quoted in *Bṛhatī*, p. 235).

From *Vākyapadīya* :—

(a) तस्माद् विडम्बनैषा— "विवर्ततेऽर्थभावेन" इति (Vākya. I. 1.).

(b) शब्दतत्त्वमेवेदमर्थरूपतया विवर्तते—इत्युक्तं शब्दविद्भिः (From Bhartṛhari's *vṛtti* on the same *kārikā*).

(c) स्वमेव रूपं शब्दस्य येयमर्थपरिणतिः। (From *Vākya, kāṇḍa* II).

the 5th cent., Diṅnāga and Bhartṛhari must be pushed back by at least a couple of centuries.

(vi) *Evidence from Mallavādī*—Mallavādī in his *Dvādaśāra-nayacakra* quotes many *kārikās* from Bhartṛhari.[47] Mallavādī was living at the time of *Valabhī-bhaṅga* (destruction of Valabhī) in A. D. 318 and he defeated the Buddhists in Vīra Saṁ. 884 (=Vik. 414=A. D. 357). This last date as given in Jain tradition, has been accepted by G. H. Bhatta, M. A.[48]

This date is also corroborated by the following internal evidence :—

(i) In his criticism of Mīmāṁsā system Mallavādī makes no mention of Kumārila, an important advocate of that school. He must, therefore, have been his predecessor. As a matter of fact, from his presentation of the *Pūrva-pakṣa*, it may be inferred that he had before him the views propounded by Bhatṛmitra (or Bhatṛprapañca) who was a predecessor of Kumārila.

(ii) Mallavādī also seems to have preceded Udyotakara, because in the presentation of the *Pūrva-pakṣa*, he makes no reference to his *Nyāyavārtika*, but seems to be familiar with the work of Praśastapāda only.

From the above it becomes clear that there was a considerable interval between Bhartṛhari and Mallavādī, the former being much anterior to the latter.

(vii) *Evidence from Diṅnāga*—If it is true that Diṅnāga quotes from Bhartṛhari as alleged by Sri Ramaswami Iyengar

---

[47] E. g., (i) यथा चाह्—'अस्त्यर्थः सर्वशब्दानाम्' इति (= *Vākya*. II. 121), p. 33 of the Chhāṇī edition.

(ii) शब्दब्रह्मतत्त्वभेदसंसर्गरूपविवर्तमात्रमिदं जगदिति । *Ibid*, p. 282. This is only a slight variation of *Vākyapadīya* I. 1.

Besides these, Prof. Pandeya has traced more than a dozen. He has also identified in the *Dvādaśāranayacakra* over 40 fragments from Diṅnāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, its *Vṛtti*, and commentaries on these.

[48] General Editor, Baroda Oriental Institute Series, in his Introduction to *Dvādasāranayacakra*.

and Muni Jambūvijaya, the date of Diṅnāga assumes a crucial significance for fixing the lower limit of Bhartṛhari's date. The upper limit is furnished by his teacher Vasurāta who defeated Diṅnāga's teacher Vasubandhu.[49]

As for Diṅnāga's date, he too is assigned to the 5th cent. which, however, appears to be untenable. For, Diṅnāga's name has been expressly mentioned by Mahārāja Samudragupta (A. D. 400)[50] in his *Kṛṣṇacarita*,[51] *viz.*—

ते राजकवयोऽमात्याः शुद्धकर्मगुणैर्भुवि।
वर्णिता अष्टगुरवो दिङ्नागप्रतिपक्षिणः ॥२८॥

From this reference it appears that the Emperor takes pride in extolling the eight venerable scholar-poets as the critics of Diṅnāga. It may, therefore, be surmised that by the time of Samudragupta Diṅnāga had acquired considerable reputation as the leading exponent of Buddhist thought. One may go a step further and add that Diṅānga must have held universal sway over the rest of the schools for some time at least, so that it came to be regarded as a matter of credit to attempt a refutation of his theories. If, therefore, the epithets used by Samudragupta for the eight teachers in the previous verses are to have any significance, Diṅnāga

---

49 Vide Mallavādi's statement in his *Dvādasāranayacakra* (Chhāṇī Ed.), pp. 109-110 : "इदानीं वसुबन्धोः स्वगुरोः ततोऽर्थाद्विज्ञानं...स्वमतं दर्शितमेव दिन्नेन वसुबन्धुप्रत्यक्षलक्षणं दूषयता..."

The traditional date assigned to Vasubandhu is 500 A. D. (vide, "*The Date of Vasubandhu*" by J. Jakakusu, J. R. A. S., Jan. 1905. It is surprising that Dr. Raghvan should have tacitly accepted that date and placed Asaṅga, the brother of Vasubandhu, in the 5th cent., ignoring all literary evidence to the contrary, (See *New Catalogue Catalogorum*, Vol. I, Madras 1949, p. 349, column 1).

50 "*Prehistoric, Ancient and Hindu India*", R. D. Bannerji, p. 117.

51 Three leaves of this lost but important work were discovered and published by Sri Jivaram Kalidas in 1941. Some scholars have doubted the authenticity of the discovery. But we have since examined the leaves and had them photographed. We intend to publish them with our Introduction, notes and block-prints of the photographs, giving in controvertible proofs of their genuineness.

must have preceded Samudragupta by at least a hundred years, and may be assigned to circa A. D. 300 at the latest. Bhartṛhari will then have to be pushed further back.

6. *Conclusion*

From the mass of evidence cited above, which has been collected from Buddhist, Jain, Mīmāṁsā and Nyāya sources, we arrive at the following relative chronological table of important writers to all of whom Bhartṛhari is anterior :—

BHARTṚHARI

Buddhist	*Jain*	*Mīmāṁsā*	*Nyāya*
Diṅnāga			
	Siddhasena		
Śaṅkarasvāmī		Prabhākara	Praśastapāda
Dharmapāla	Mallavādī Samantabhadra	Bhartṛmitra ?	Udyotakara
Īśvarasena Dharmakīrti (C. 600 A.D.)	} Śīlabhadra	Kumārila (C. 550 A.D.)	
Hiuen Tsang 625 A.D.			
I-tsing 691-92 A.D.			

Although no definite date could be assigned to Bhartṛhari for the present, it becomes sufficiently clear from the overwhelming evidence that he cannot be placed later than the 3rd century A. D. and may be even earlier. Further research should concentrate on collecting conclusive evidence regarding the dates of Vasubandhu, Vasurāta, Mallavādī and other important and relevant writers who furnish the

lower limit of Bhartṛhari. The date of Vasubandhu (which we shall discuss in another paper) is, however, one of the most controversial problems of literary chronology. In our opinion the correct date of Vasubandhu should confirm rather than overthrow our conclusions regarding the dates of Diṅnāga and Bhartṛhari. The dates of Vasubandhu, Bhartṛhari and Diṅnāga turn, in final analysis, on the dates assigned to Candragupta and Samudragupta. They in their turn hinge on the wider question of the beginnings of the Gupta era which should not be taken to have been finally settled by Fleet and his present-day followers.[52]

(Note : I must thank Prof. A. N. Pandeya who has very kindly allowed me to take help from his unpublished material which I have acknowledged in this article.)

---

[52] For alternative hypothesis see Pt. Bhagavad Datta's "*Bhāratavarṣa kā Itihāsa*" in Hindi, 2nd edition, Saṁ. 2003, pp. 326-348.

THE PLACE OF KAUṬILYA'S *ARTHAŚĀSTRA* IN THE HINDU LEGAL HISTORY

By U. C. Sarkar

After the earliest *Dharma-sūtras*, the work that deserves the greatest attention is the famous *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya. After the epoch-making discovery of this work, various competent authors have expressed themselves from various stand-points regarding the time, authorship and the character of the work. The references on this subject are too numerous for enumeration. There cannot be any doubt that Kauṭilya or Cāṇakya, the famous minister of Candragupta Maurya was the author of this book which must have been composed about 300 B. C. Kauṭilya had a wonderful personality and genius. He was believed to have been responsible for the overthrow and the destruction of the Nanda kings. Though the maker of an empire and emperor, Cāṇakya had a calm and philosophic indifference towards worldly pleasure and plenty. Thus his philosophy could be well-nigh epitomised by the following famous couplet :

"Aśīmahi vayaṃ bhikṣām āśāvaśo vaśīmahi
Śayīmahi mahīpṛiṣṭhe kurvīmahi kimīśvaraiḥ ?"

Regarding the nature of the work, it must be said that quite a new path was chalked out by him. His subject matter was Arthaśāstra. Of course, Cāṇakya himself refers to many foregoing authors of Arthaśāstra; but no such work has ever come down to us up to the present time. As it is, the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya must be contrasted with the foregoing *Dharmasūtras*. The *Dharmasūtras* (and also the Dharmaśāstras) were clearly

works on Dharma where the term Dharma was used in the most comprehensive sense to include the different branches of the sciences necessary for the regulations of human life from the standpoints of the different stages and the castes. But the *Arthaśāstra* dealt exclusively with the rights and duties of the king from the standpoints of actual administration involving the creation and regulation of the different departments of the government including the most important organ of the state *viz.*, the judiciary. Thus viewed, the *Arthaśāstra* is only a part of Dharmaśāstra. This is also corroborated by the view of Vijñāneśvara (on *Yājñavalkya*, ii, 21) according to whom "Dharmaśāstrāntargatameva rājanīti lakṣṇārthaśāstramidaṃ vivakṣitaṃ." Hence, the precise relation between the *Dharmasūtras* (also the Dharmaśāstras) on the one hand and the Arthaśāstra on the other is that the former briefly deals with more or less all the aspects of society and also the state whereas the latter fully deals with the functions and the organisations of the different organs of the state exclusively. For this consideration, law being one of the aspects of both the social and the administrative machinery has been treated by both the types of literature—the only distinction, however, in the treatment being that the Dharmasūtras did not systematically and exclusively deal with law whereas the Arthaśāstra deals with political administration in general devoting exclusive chapters to the treatment of law. This exclusive and systematic treatment of law was a distinct achievement of the Arthaśāstra as contrasted with the foregoing *Dharmasūtras*. This tendency was accentuated even in the early Dharmaśāstras of Manu and Yājñavalkya awaiting culmination at the hands of Nārada and Bṛhaspati. If Manu and Yājñavalkya devoted separate chapters to vyavahāra or law, in their works, Nārada and Bṛhaspati devoted their entire works to the treatment of law alone. Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* had some

marked characteristics : it was mainly secular and as such virtually divorced from all sorts of religious and sacerdotal elements. Of course, there are occasional references to sacrifices (by way of illustrations), the other priestly duties of the Brahmins and the propitiation of the God Varuṇa in cases of crimes and transgressions. But these references are very few and far between. The rules enunciated in the *Arthaśāstra* were based on the actual administration of the state and there was hardly any supernatural question at any stage or in any matter.

In his *Arthaśāstra*, Kauṭilya devotes two Books to law—to wit, Dharmasthīya and Kaṇṭakaśodhanaṃ. The former is supposed to deal with civil law and the latter with criminal law. But this generalisation is not quite tenable—inasmuch as in the Book on Dharmasthīya there are many topics which are really to be included in the Book on criminal law and in the latter again there are many topics which deal more or less with the administration rather than with the judiciary and with the prevention of certain crimes rather than with the punishment or otherwise of crimes when committed. There are no doubt certain topics dealing with criminal law in the Book on Kaṇṭakaśodhanaṃ. In style, however, the *Asthaśāstra* is more akin to the *Dharmasūtras* both being mainly written in prose. Some verses are to be found of course in both the types of the works.

It need not be supposed, however, that the origin of Hindu positive law (or vyavahāra) must be sought in the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya and its precursors. As a matter of fact, we do not know of any other works on Arthaśāstra except in name. Necessarily, the exact nature of their contents also is not known to us, if they existed at all. Above all, law has been treated in the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya not in an exclusive fashion; law has been treated there only as a fraction of the whole contents. Hence there is

no sufficient warrant for Jayaswal's theory[1] that the origin of civil law of later Hindu epochs must be sought in the Arthaśāstra rather than the *Dharmasūtras*. The truth seems to be that the *Dharmasūtras* were the earliest original treatises on Hindu law and that the Arthaśāstra played its part only by having intervened the religio-socio-legal literature of the *Dharmasūtras*. The observations of Kane are also very instructive in this connection. The rest of the discussion here will be chiefly confined to Kaṇṭakaśodhanam.

In Book IV of his *Arthaśāstra*, Kauṭilya deals with Kaṇṭakaśodhanaṃ which is wrongly supposed to deal with criminal law exclusively. The word kaṇṭaka means artisans according to the Tamil and Malayālam commentaries. There is hardly any discussion of substantive criminal law proper in Book IV. Whatever criminal law has been dealt with therein is merely concerned with police functions or preventive measures along with some means employed for detecting crimes and some methods of punishment. Almost all the usual topics of criminal law had already been discussed in the last four chapters of Book III. An examination of the contents of Book IV will at once show the truth of the above observations. The use of the word kaṇṭaka is very significant. The different kaṇṭakas (thorns) are the potential sources of certain illegal and criminal acts, which if not checked or prevented, will surely stand in the way of the smooth working of society and the administration of law as a whole. The last verse at the erd of chapter I of Book IV will explain the real character of the different kaṇṭakas or sources of mischief to society. The traders, artisans, musicians,

---

[1] Tagore Law Lectures, 1917, on Manu and Yājñavalkya, Calcutta Universiry Lecture, 1.

beggars, buffoons and other idlers[2] are thieves in effect though not in name and as such, they must be restrained from perpetrating oppressions on the society.

There is hardly anything of criminal law in Chapter I except that for selling, mortgaging, or letting out for hire the clothes of others, washermen shall be fined 12 Paṇas, and that physicians shall be guilty of negligence and carelessness when the patients die or the diseases aggravate by their mistake or ignorance. To prevent the merchants from practising deception, the weights and measures shall be examined and scrutinised. This is also more preventive than punitive. In Chapter III, there is a discussion about the different kinds of national calamities only rather than any topic of law except that in cases where people are being carried away by floods, persons neglecting rescue work with the exception of those who have no boats shall be fined 12 Paṇas. These measures also are more administrative than judicial. The national calamities might appear in the shape of fire, flood, pestilences, famines, rats, snakes, tigers and demons--to disturb the people and the tranquillity of society. Chapters IV to VI deal with suppression of the wicked living by foul means, detection of youths of criminal tendency by ascetic spies and the arrest of criminals on suspicion or in the very act of committing the crimes. These are the different duties which have been ascribed by Kauṭilya to the Collector General or the Pradeṣṭā who is an administrative officer without any judicial function at all. In the verse at the end of Chapter IV, Kauṭilya refers to 13 kinds of criminals who secretly attempt to live by foul means and thereby destroy the peace of society. These disturbing elements should be either banished or compelled to pay an adequate compensation or to

[2] The list of arisans is simply enumerative rather than exhaustive. Taking advantage of their occupations, the artisans, could not be allowed to practise fraud or any other offence.

furnish a sufficient security. The Collector General shall employ spies in the guise of ascetics, bards, astrologers, prophets etc. who by various traps shall find out the different culprits such as false witnesses, manufacturers of counterfiet coins etc. According to the verse at the end of Chapter V, the Collector General shall exhibit in public the arrested criminals and thus proclaim the omniscience of the king and the never-failing vigilance of the king's officers among the people. The .commissioner also with his retinue of Gopas and Stānikas shall take adequate measures for arresting external as well as internal thieves.

Chapter VII deals with the examination of accidental or un-natural death. Kauṭilya gives several hints for ascertaining the real cause of death or murder; but this chapter does not contain any element of law—civil or criminal. On the contrary, towards the close of the chapter Cāṇakya refers to certain verses according to which directions have been given for the disposal of the dead body and the religious rites that have to be performed on occasions like these. No crematorial rites or obsequies by relations could be performed in cases of murders or suicides. Chapter VIII deals with the different methods of trial and tortures for eliciting confession. Torture could be resorted to only when there was strong and sufficient grounds of suspicion and reasonable belief that the suspected person has actually committed the crime in question. Persons charging innocent men with theft or any other crime shall be punished as having committed the same offence. Women were to be subjected to half or no torture at all. In their cases cross-examination could be resorted to as a weapon for discovering the truth. There could not be any torture for the Brāhmaṇas also. Chapter IX deals with penal measures which could protect people from being oppressed at the hands of the public servants under the colour of their authority and office appertaining to the different de-

partments of the administration. As a matter of fact, very stringent rules were provided for the punishment of the government servants in cases of crimes wilfully committed by them. In this sense, the government servants, on account of their very office, were subjected to additional liability to be more careful and considerate in dealing with the people at large. The reasons for this high standard of honesty and integrity on the part of the government servants have been very lucidly given in the verse at the end of the chapter. Thus the royal officers and their subordinates should be tested first; as it is through them that the criminals were to be punished. If they were themselves dishonest, no true and honest work could be expected of them for the benefit of the public.

Chapter X provides for alternative fines in lieu of mutilation of limbs. When specially the government servants were guilty of offences, such as violation of sacred institutions or pick-pocketting, for the fourth time, they were to be put to death. Up to the commission of the offences for the third time, fines could be paid instead of multilation of limbs. For the offences of theft of various articles, adultery and abetment of these offences, the hands, feet, nose, or ears could be cut off according to the gravity of the ofience. But the person committing theft regarding images of God, men, gold coins, precious stones etc. were to be beheaded or to pay the highest amercement. Any person selling human flesh was to be condemned to death. In the concluding verse at the end of the chapter, Cāṇakya makes a very comprehensive provision for inflicting different kinds of punishments taking into consideration all the relevant facts and circumstances of the case including the social status, the antecedents, the family, the occasion and the time and place of the offence.

Chapter XI deals with certain offences which must be punished with death with or without torture. In the

concluding verse of this chapter Kauṭilya refers to the views of the sages who have provided for capital punishment; but at the same time it has been added that no torture should be resorted to where there was no cruelty involved in the offence in question. Simple death would be sufficient for offences without any cruelty. The different methods of inflicting capital punishment were hanging, burning, drowning, shooting, and tearing with the help of bulls. Sometimes mutilations of limbs and the punishment of the highest amercement could be imposed according to the gravity of the offences. Different kinds of capital punishments were provided for different kinds of murder.

Chapter XII deals with the sexual offences in general and such offences against immature girls in particular. The crimes concerning sexual offences ought to have been discussed along with the other usual types of crimes such as robbery, assault, theft etc. in Book III. The general provision of Chapter XII are that no man shall have sexual intercourse with a woman against her will; that women also yielding themselves for the offence are to be punished equally with the principal offenders. There were also at the same time some special provisions in cases where a man of the same caste could be criminally intimate with a maiden who might remain un-married for three years after the attainment of her puberty. It was not an offence even in the case of a man of different caste when the maiden had no jewellery on her person. Again a man rescuing a woman from enemy, forest, flood etc. could enjoy her with her consent if agreed upon.

The last chapter of Book IV deals with different kinds of punishment for violating justice. The term justice has been used in a comprehensive sense including "varṇa-dharma" trespass, nuisance, assault, witchcraft, compensation to be paid to the merchants by the king's officers or villagers

in cases where any merchandise is stolen from the merchants in course of their journeys, the injuries resulting from the different kinds of tamed animals and lastly some sort of penances to be performed by the king to get rid of the sin resulting from the unjust imposition of punishment specially on the innocent. According to this provision, the king is to dedicate some money to God Varuṇa by throwing the same into the water.

PĀṆINI'S NOTION OF THE AUTHORITATIVENESS OF THE VIEWS OF HIS PREDECESSORS

By RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA

A comprehensive study on the Pāṇinian works would prove that before the compositions of Pāṇini, many authoritative grammatical treatises had come into light and Pāṇini accepted the essential and fruitful principles, laid down by his predecessors, for many opinions of the former grammarians and grammatical traditions have been frequently referred to in his works. Here a question may arise as to—to what extent Pāṇini accepted the authoritativeness of these views of his predecessors and what was Pāṇini's notion in referring to them? We propose to deal with this question in the following pages in brief.

(A) Before coming into discussion regarding the aforesaid question, we want to say something about the character of the proper names, referred to in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Names, like Āpiśali etc. are no doubt अपत्यप्रत्ययान्त (i. e. the secondary suffix denotes an Apatya, a son in general), because they are derived by the rule 'अत इञ्' (IV. i. 95) which is under the province (अधिकार) of तस्यापत्यम् (IV. i. 92), hence the name of his father is Apiśala. The name of Kāśyapa is गोत्रप्रत्ययान्त (i. e., the secondary suffix denotes a गोत्र), hence the ancestor of Kāśyapa is Kaśyapa. According to the Pāṇinian terminology there is difference between an अपत्य and a गोत्र (vide Sūtra IV. i. 62[1]). Here a thing is to be noted that though an अपत्य means a son, yet, in many places it is taken to denote the sense of a son in general i. e. a grandson may also be taken as an अपत्य (vide the

---

[1] The term गोत्र is technical (अपत्यं पौत्रप्रभृति गोत्रम् IV. i, 162), though it is used by Pāṇini in the sense familiar in the smṛtis. Commentators expressly showed the proper places where both these senses are applicable vide the *Bālamanoramā* and the *Tattvabodhinī* on the Apatya-section of the Siddhānta Kamudi.

Mahabhāṣya on एको गोत्रे IV. i. 93 with *Pradīpa* and *Uddyota*). We find the name of Gālava in Sutra VII. i. 13, but it is difficult to understand the exact stem of this word ; it may be गलु or गलव. In many ancient works, such as the *Nirukta*, the *Brahaddevatā* etc., though we get the name of Gālava, yet no reference of गलु or गलव has yet been found. These two names are wanting in the Pāṇinian Gaṇapāṭha even. The name of Śākaṭāyana is found in many Sūtras (III. iv. 11, VIII. iii. 18 etc.). The word शकट is found in the नडादिगण (IV. i. 99), hence the name of his grandfather should be शकट, but Patañjali says that Śākaṭāyana is the तोक (son) of शकट (III. iii. 1 Bh.) To reconcile both these views, we can say that Patañjali used the term तोक in a wider sense i. e. in the sense of a grandson, because in the old *Nighaṇṭu* (II. ii) the term तोक is read as a synonym of a son in general (अपत्यसामान्य). The name of Senaka is found in Sūtra V. iv. 111. Nothing can be known regarding his ancestry through the character of this word. Ācārya Sphoṭāyana is recalled in Sūtra VI. i. 123. According to Haradatta, a commentator on the *Kāśikā*, this term is not the actual name of the Ācārya, but an epithet, i. e., as the learned scholar was highly well-versed in the doctrine of Sphoṭa, hence he was called so (स्फोटोऽयनं परायणं यस्य स स्फोटायनः, स्फोटप्रतिपादनपरो वैयाकरणाचार्यः). Such an epithet, in place of a name, is not found elsewhere in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, and hence one may raise doubt about the correctness of this comment. If the view of Haradatta is true, then it is also to be understood that the real name of the Ācārya had come in disuse, or this epithet became more popular instead of his actual name. Some read स्फौटायन in place of स्फोटायन (*Padamañjarī*). According to them, the name of his ancestor is स्फोट, but the actual reading of the Sūtra is स्फोटायन and not स्फौटायन.[2] The name of भारद्वाज

[2] Vide my Sanskrit monograph 'श्रीमद्भगवत्पाणिनिसंमतसूत्रपाठनिर्णयः'.

is found in Sūtra VII. ii. 63. It is possible that the word भरद्वाज is the stem of भारद्वाज. Some say that Pāṇini used the term भारद्वाज for the grammar, composed by भरद्वाज, who is referred to in the *Ṛktantra* of Śākaṭāyana. Here it should be noted that Pāṇini always mentioned the names of his predecessors and not their works, and so we are in doubt about the correctness of this opinion.

(B) It may be asked as to why Pānini had referred to the names of his predecessors in his new composition. Could he not mention the rules without referring to the names of the authorities? It is quite reasonable that an opinion held by a particular teacher might not be accepted by a different school and this is why Pāṇini became compelled to mention the authority for a particular rule (which was not accepted universally for its proper application). But whether such views were accepted by Pānini also or not—is a question to be thought of. We are of opinion that Pānini also accepted the views, associated with some name of his predecessors, otherwise he could have rejected that view totally. There are ample examples, which prove that Pāṇini did not mention many views of his authoritative predecessors, which he thought as corrupt according to his own conception of correctness of words (शब्दसाधुत्व) or which came in disuse in course of time, and consequently were not sanctioned by the people[3]. Mentioning of a rule by Pāṇini (with the name of a former grammarian) doubtlessly proves that it was supported by Pāṇini, because it appears that no refutable opinion was compiled by Pānini in his works, as is found in the *Brahma-Sūtras* or *Sāṅkhya-Sūtras* etc. From the available materials, it can easily be observed that in many places Pāṇini changed the process of his predecessors or invented a new one where he thought the principles or processes of his predecessors as incorrect,

[3] Vide my paper: Some Characteristics of Pāṇini in comparison to Those of His Predecessors.

hence it may reasonably be concluded that all the views, referred to by Pāṇini were obviously accepted by him as correct.

It may be asked : Do all the proper names, shown in the *Aṣṭādhāyī*, denote the sense of mere optionality (as is held by modern grammarians)? If it be so then anyone can call for account for the term 'वा' in the Sūtra 'वा सुप्यापिशलेः' (VI. i. 92). Why are both the terms (वा and आपिशलि) read together ? Here old commentators say that the name of Āpiśali was taken *honouris causa* (पूजार्थं). But what does this term signify ? All the views of the predecessors (quoted in the *Aṣṭā.*) were deemed by Pāṇini as authoritative, hence पूजार्थनामग्रहण (referring to a proper name to show deference) is the common characteristic of all the Sūtras associated with some proper name. What actually Pāṇini thought is that as 'वा सुपि' was the opinion of Āpiśali only, hence the Sūtra was composed in the aforesaid manner. Each proper name has got proper significance (i. e. acceptance by the referred teacher), otherwise more than one name would not have been referred to in one Sūtra, such as VII. iii. 99 and VIII. iv. 67 or on one particular topic two separate opinions of two different Ācāryas would not have been quoted (vide the topic on द्वित्व VIII. iv. 50-51).

There are also some views, though associated with the name of any former Ācārya, yet commentators say that the rule is not an optional one, but a universal. The Sūtra ओतो गार्ग्यस्य (VIII. iii. 20) is an example of this kind. This rule is said to be a compulsory one, though it is associated with the name of Gārgya. Now the question arises as to if this rule be नित्य (compulsory) then why is it attributed to Gārgya ? As all compulsory rules are mentioned without quoting any authority, so why is this anomaly done ? As usual, commentators try to defend themselves with their popular interpretation that the name of Gārgya is taken

honouris causa. But it is a lame excuse as said before. It is to be gravely thought of as to why a rule of Gārgya became compulsory, while all rules of other teachers are said to be optional. If the statement 'पूजार्थनामग्रहण' has any reasonable and intelligible ground, then it is to be explained as follows:

Due to some unknown reasons, Ācārya Gārgya was closely connected with the rule VIII. iii. 20, i. e. he was the foremost exponent of this rule, or when verbal usages, in accordance with this rule (VIII. iii. 20) came in vogue, then Gārgya only became the strongest supporter of such usages. But in later period, all schools accepted these usages universally, and this is why this rule is explained as a compulsory one. Of course, we cannot say definitely whether this rule was deemed as compulsory by Pāṇini or not. Maintaining of the name of Gārgya proves that the exposition of the commentators is wrong so far as the notion of Pāṇini is concerned. We cannot understand as to why a universal rule would be attributed to a particular teacher. According to our opinion, the name of Gārgya is recalled because he was the founder or the strongest supporter of this particular rule, though due to some reasons, it became universally accepted in later period, provided that the remark of the commentators regarding the universal acceptance of this rule becomes correct. We find a second type of instance of पूजार्थनामग्रहण in Sūtra गिरेश्च सेनकस्य (V. iv. 112). According to the commentators the name is taken *honouris causa.* The reason is that the term अन्यतरस्याम् of the preceding Sūtra (V. iv. 111) is related with this Sūtra (V. iv. 112) and hence the name of सेनक cannot be accepted to denote the sense of optionality, but it is taken *honouris causa.* But as the mentioning of the authorities has some inner significance, other than mere devotion to optionality (i. e. mentioning a view, advocated by a particular Ācārya, which is also accepted by Pāṇini, but not by other author-

ties), hence, the reasoning of the commentators is not sound. According to Pāṇini, गिरेश्च is the view of Senaka, or if the relation of अन्यतरस्याम् with this Sūtra is poor authoritatively, then 'गिरेश्चास्यान्यतरस्याम्' should be the Senakian view. As a matter of fact, mentioning the names of former teachers is never meant to denote the sense of mere optionality or sense of deference, as will be proved later on.

(C) There is a very subtle thing to be observed regarding the character of authority of the pre-Pāṇinian teachers. The Sūtra लोपः शाकल्यस्य (VIII. ii. 19) prescribes an elision; now, will this elision be accepted by Śākalya and his followers and not by other teachers or traditions? There is no doubt that the Pāṇinian order would accept this opinion as sanctioned by Pāṇini also as said before, but what to say about all non-Pāṇinian Schools? At present such rules are regarded as mere optional ones and Patañjali, in his scholium or 'नवेति विभाषा' (I. i. 43) expressly says that these names do not denote any पुरुषभेदप्रयुक्तव्यवस्था (i. e. rules of a particular teacher to be observed by him or by his followers) but the sense of optionality only. Patañjali supported his view taking shelter in the doctrine of the eternity of words (शब्दनित्यतावाद). But with due deference to the levelheaded scholar, I beg to state that this reason is submitted for practical purposes only, though the real significance is somewhat different which is going to be discussed in sequel. It cannot be reasonably understood as to how about one dozen names of different teachers are mentioned only to indicate the sense of mere optionality, when there are terms like 'वा' etc. to express the same sense in a distinct and clear manner and which were used by Pāṇini in many aphorisms. Hence here lies a historical truth, which is elaborated here for the reconciliation of both the view-points of Pāṇini and Patañjali. It is as follows:

When Pāṇini composed his work, at that time the rules, attributed to some pre-Pāṇinian teachers, were of

course accepted only by their respective exponents, as said before, as for instance only Ācārya Sphoṭāyana and his school were of opinion for the operation of अवङ् and none else, as indicated by Pāṇini in the Sūtra 'अवङ् स्फोटायनस्य' (VI. i. 23). Due to the maintaining of the name of Sphoṭāyana, it can easily be conceived that the rule was neither accepted universally nor was it an optional one. Reasons for our assumption have already been given before and hence we can plainly draw the conclusion that the अवङादेश was accepted by Sphoṭāyana and his followers only and this is why Pāṇini referred to his name. But in later period, (i.e. by the time of Patañjali) when gradually Sanskrit came in disuse, and all schools of grammatical teachers began to decay, then this पुरुषभेदप्रयुक्तव्यवस्था served no real purpose practically. As for instance, though Sphoṭāyana only advocated the operation of अवङ् yet, in later period, all, irrespective of any school or tradition, began to operate अवङादेश optionally. This is not a mere conjecture or a groundless assumption only, but a proved hypothesis, because in the time of decay, all things lose their distinctive marks and all particularities become devoid of their rigid forms. The same thing happened even in the case of particular usages of Sanskrit. In all the languages, we find that many particular usages, accepted by a school, or current in any particular region gradually become universal in course of time. As by the time of Patañjali restrictions of respective schools, totally lost their rigid character (i.e. application of the rule by their exponents and their followers only), so Patañjaii thought that it would be better to explain these names as being used only to denote the sense of mere optionality, because in fact all these particular rules were regarded as universal in his time, otherwise he dare not explain the cause of mentioning these proper names by Pāṇini in the said manner. Hence, though the explanation of Patañjali is fruitful for the practical use of modern

Sanskrit, yet it lacks the inner significance according to the view-point of Pāṇini. In this connection it should be noted that in post-Pāṇinian grammatical works, all rules of pre-Paṇinian teachers, referred to in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, are reproduced with the terms like 'वा', अन्यतरस्याम् etc. The authors of these later works obviously thought that as all particular rules have totally lost their particularity (i. e. application of the rules by their respective teachers and their followers) and they are accepted as only general optional rules, so it is needless to mention the names of the particular Ācārya, as is done by Pāṇini.

If we look into the aforesaid principle deeply, we would come to know that even Pānini himself had trodden on the same path. All significant terms gradually lose their primal significance, and in later period no stress is laid on the distinct character of particular terms by the people who use them. Owing to this fact, there occurs difference in view-points in subsequent grammatical treatises and the Sūtra लुब् योगाप्रख्यानात् (I. ii. 54) may be taken as an instance of the above principle. We know on the authority of the *Mahābhārata* etc. that the names of Janapadas are often put according to the name of the inhabitants of that Janapada. Pāṇini also supported this view. Thus we can say as for an instance that though there was some causal relation between the Pāñcāla-race and the Pañcāla, Janapada, yet in later period, when the Pāñcāla-race came into decay, then the name of the Janapada (i. e. Pāñcāla) though lost its significance, yet remained current in popular speech. Now, in the time of Pāṇini, as there was no cognisable significance of the name (Pañcāla) of the Janapada due to the abolition of the Pāñcāla-race, so Pāṇini became compelled to compose a Sūtra as 'योगप्रमाणे च तदभावेऽदर्शनं स्यात्' (I. ii. 55), which refutes the principle of nomenclature of the Janapadas according to the name of their dwellers. Here we find that when the terms of particular significance lose

their significance, in later period, then later exponents explain them as arbitrary terms or they are explained as mere proper names only. We observe the same truth in the view of Patañjali even, regarding the significance of the names of the pre-Pāṇinian teachers, i. e. having noticed that all particular usages of particular teachers, are only deemed as optional ones by the people of his time and that they are not only applied by their respective exponents or their followers, Patañjali said that these proper names denoted the sense of optionality only.

(D) We have already seen that Patañjali explained the names of the pre-Pāṇinian teachers as mere indicators of the sense of optionality. In other words, he prefers the use of 'वा' instead of the names of the ancient teachers, referred to by Pāṇini. We have also shown that the change of time is the cause of such an apparently correct statement[4]. Now we find that Pāṇini also had used the terms like 'वा' etc. to denote optionality. Here one can put a question whether all these optional views were deemed as particular ones advocated by particular teachers in pre-Pāṇinian period, and (in later period) Pāṇini, seeing that these particular views had lost their particularity (i. e. use of words by their exponents and their followers only) used the terms 'वा' etc. instead of the names of the Pre-Pāṇinian teachers. In this connection we submit our statement as follows :

It is a true fact that all the optional forms of all words do not necessarily originate from the same point of time, but a correct word, in course of time, due to suitable causes, originate similar other forms. At their first occurence, these new forms become particular usages as some teachers accept them and some refute them, but afterwards all these

[4] According to the change of time, there happens difference (or even contradictory ideas) in the view-points of subsequent works of later exponents. This problem is dealt with at length in may Sanskrit Book, 'श्रीगद्भगवत्पाणिनिसम्मतसूत्रार्थनिर्णयः'.

particular forms are used optionally without following the पुरुषभेदप्रयुक्तव्यवस्था, i.e. irrespective of any teacher or school which was strictly observed at their first occurence. At this time, a grammarian will have to consider these different usages as optional ones because they are deemed so by the people[5]. We find the same case in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* also It can easily be known from the Sūtra जराया जरसन्यतरस्याम् (VII. ii. 101) that Pāṇini considered both the usages (जरसौ-जरे) as mere optional forms, without any पुरुषभेदप्रयुक्तव्यवस्था, but the truth is something else. We find in the Jaina Śākaṭāyana-Vyākaraṇa a Sūtra as 'जराया ङसिन्द्रस्याचि (I. ii. 37), which shows that Ācārya Indra was of the opinion of जरसादेश. But as in later period this particular form was deemed as optional, hence all later grammarians showed both the forms as optional only. We are fortunate enough that Śākaṭāyana recalled the first advocate of this usage. He did it because he thought that जरसादेश should not be deemed as an optional form. We have already said that all particular views of different Ācāryas (as shown by Pāṇini) deemed as mere optional ones by post-Pāṇinian grammarians, due to the simple reason that by their time, the पुरुषभेदप्रयुक्तव्यवस्था, shown by Pāṇini had become abolished.[6]

For this love of brevity and easy comprehension

---

[5] It cannot be said that there happened no change in the body of Sanskrit. Had the character of Sanskrit been immutable, there would not arise any difference of opinion among ancient grammarians, who are described as ऋषि i.e. Seekers of Truth. It is the induced rule that all things, which have existance are mutable, except the Metempiric Consciousness (प्रतिक्षणं परिणामिनो हि सर्व एवभावा ऋते चितिशक्तेः :—Vācaspati Miśra in his *Sāṅkhya-Tattva Kaumudī*). Change is the inherent property of the material phenomena—is also observed by the Sage Vārṣagaṇya (vide the *Nirukta*), therefore it cannot be said that the Sanskrit language is unchangeable. The real import of the नित्यशब्दवाद has been misunderstood since a long period, which has been discussed at length in my Sanskrit book 'श्रीमद्भगवत्पाणिनिसम्मतसूत्रार्थनिर्णयः'.

[6] Vide my Sanskrit book — 'श्रीमद्भगवत्पाणिनिसम्मतसूत्रार्थनिर्णयः where this problem is discussed at length,

Pāṇini sometimes used the term वा instead of giving a fuller and detailed account regarding the character of restriction of any grammatical rule as may be proved from the Sūtra स्वरितो वाऽनुदात्ते पदादौ' (VIII. ii 6). Though Pāṇini had prescribed optionality (वा), yet we find that this स्वरित accent is not operated optionally in the recensions of the Vedas, as may be proved from the Prātiśākhyas.

(E) It is to be curiously noted that while Pāṇini had referred to the views of his predecessors on even non-essential topics of his *Aṣṭādhyāyī* he remained silent in quoting the views of his former grammarians in the three essential sections of his learned tract, i. e. in कृत्, तद्धित and समास sections. Thus one becomes inclined to think that as no view of the pre-Pāṇinian teachers is cited by Pāṇini in these three important sections, so it is quite possible that the pre-Pāṇinian teachers did not at all make any exposition on the said topics. We find that these three topics are totally wanting in the Prātiśākhyas. But from the aphorisms and views of pre-Pāṇinian teachers, quoted in later works, it becomes undoubtedly proved that some pre-Pāṇinian teachers also discussed on the said three topics. Sūtra V. iv. 122 shows that Ācārya Senaka had laid rules regarding समासान्त which is quite impossible without an exposition of समास. It cannot be said that there was no contradictory view of Pāṇini in comparison to those of his predecessors and this is why he remained silent in quoting the formers' views because we find that Pāṇini did not mention those ancient views which he thought as corrupt according to his own conception of the correctness of words (शब्दसाधुत्व) as said before. Therefore, we are to conclude that though in pre-Pāṇinian works, the said topics were obviously discussed, yet that discussion was of the type of a general enunciation and only induced rules were elaborated in brief.

It is also to be noted that these three topics are directly connected with the वृत्ति, which is defined by Patañjali as

'परार्थाभिधानम्': (vide *Mahābhāṣya* on II. i. 1). This वृत्ति becomes developed in course of time, with the varieties of human affairs, but on the other hand, we find that the types of सन्धि etc. do not grow in number gradually in course of time because it is not connected with the वृत्ति. Thus it becomes clear that there were no such varieties of कृत्, तद्धित and समास in ancient period as are found in later period. A comparative study of Vedic expressions and those of later literature would at once prove the solidity of our assumption. Hence it can be said that as Pāṇini's exposition of these topics is fuller and more comprehensive in comparison to the expositions made by pre-Pāṇinian teachers, hence, Pānini felt no need to mention the views of his predecessors, as there cannot happen any conflict between the general and special rules. Pāṇini compiled all the special rules as far as possible, which is one of his chief characteristics.[7]

It is also to be noted in passing that in pre-Pāṇinian works, many faculties of तद्धितवृत्ति were not taken into account as is remarked by Bhartṛhari in his *Vākyapadīya*: 'तदर्हमिति नारब्धं सूत्रं व्याकरणान्तरे' and the term व्याकरणान्तर (other grammars) is explained by Helārāja as 'the works of Āpiśali and Kāśakṛtsna', both of which are undoubtedly pre-Pāninian.

There is another reason as to why the pre-Pāṇinian teachers did not elaborate the said 3 sections in full detail. It is due to the very character of these वृत्ति's, which is admirably expressed by Patañjali as 'अभिधानलक्षणाः कृत्तद्धितसमासाः' (*Bhāṣya*. . . .). Even after the details supplied by Pāṇini, we are forced to take the help of अभिधान[8] for the proper

[7] Vide the commentary of Durgādās on the *Mugdhabodha* Sūtra 220.

[8] In Grammar, this अभिधान has got direct supremacy over the Sūtras of the aforesaid topics. It, is defined as 'शिष्टानां ततोऽर्थबोधरूपम्' by Nāgeśa (*Sabdendusekhara*) Many Pāṇinian Sūtras are refuted through the power of अभिधान, without any further reasons, for which Bhaṭṭoji became compelled to remark: अनभिधानब्रह्मास्त्रमाश्रित्य प्रत्याख्यानं तु नातीव मनोरमम्' (*Śabda Kaustubha*).

use of these three topics. By the power of this dictum, Patañjali refuted many Sūtras or parts thereof of these three sections, and thus one may draw the inference that the background of these refutations is the absence of such Sūtras in the works of the pro-Pāṇinian works. It is also to be noted in passing that Pāṇini used the plural number in the Sūtra तद्धिताः (IV. i. 76) whereas in similar Sūtras he used singular number. Can it possibly be said that by using the plural number Paṇini intended to denote that the तद्धितवृत्तिs cannot totally be elaborated in the limited compass of any grammatical treatise. As a matter of fact, we find that many तद्धितवृत्तिs have not yet been compiled by Pāṇini and this is why our celebrated teacher meekly composed one of his तद्धित Sūtra as शेषे (IV. ii. 92). I think that such line of thinking enabled Rājaśekhara to remark as तद्धितमूढाः पाणिनीयाः which though an exaggeration, yet shows the inner character of the तद्धितवृत्तिs. The vṛtti has an unequal position in the field of Sanskrit Grammar, which will be dealt with in my forthcoming monograph : 'The Character of अभिधान in Sanskrit Grammar'.

(F) The word आचार्य is used in the Sūtra आदाचार्याणाम् (VII. iii. 49) in spite of the actual name of the teacher. It may be asked as to in what sense this term is used. According to the *Padamañjarī*[9] this term denotes the Guru (teacher) of Pāṇini himself and according to the *Bālamanoramā*, आचार्याणाम् means केषाञ्चिदाचार्याणाम्. We are of opinion that through the power of the term 'आचार्य', Pāṇini analysed those verbal usages, which were though accepted by many authoritative teachers as correct, yet some teachers accepted them as incorrect (असाधु). Hence Pāṇini saw no way, but to use the word, आचार्याणाम्, because usages, which were accepted and at the same time rejected by different groups of scholars, cannot be deemed as purely correct or purely

[9] (Vol. 2 Page 821).

incorrect. In such cases terms like 'वा' etc. are not applicable, because such terms denote the sense of mere optionality irrespective of any school or teacher, held by all at the time of the composition as said before and both the optional usages are regarded as equally correct without any kind of restriction—traditional or regional. But here i. e. in the Sūtra VII. iii. 49, the case is different, as all scholars did not equally hold the correctness of both the optional forms made by this Sūtra. Had they held the correctness of both the optional forms, there arose no need of using the term आचार्य and terms like 'वा' etc. would suffice. In the case in question, Pāṇini neither dared refute the opinion (as it was accepted by many authoritative teachers) nor could he use the terms like 'वा' etc. due to the aforesaid reason, nor even he could put these rules as universal, but he became compelled to use the word आचार्यणाम्. Had such usages been accepted by a few teachers only, say two or three, their names would have been noted, as is done in some places, but here the case is different as many of the teachers and schools held the correctness. It is impossible or rather useless to note the names of the authorities in such cases and Pāṇini thought it better to use the term 'आचार्य' in plural number which would denote his notion more clearly. There is no ground to believe that the term आचार्य was used by Pāṇini for his Guru. Had it been so, Pāṇini could expressly tell the name of his revered teacher as the taking of the name of one's own Ācārya seems to be a very ancient style, being adopted by Ācāryas like Jaimini etc. Moreover, we seldom find the plural number, used to denote deference to the learned Guru in ancient literature, hence we think that the opinion of Haradatta is a mere conjecture and that of the *Bālamanoramā* is justified.

One may raise objection that let there be no necessity to add the names of the authorities with the rules, accepted universally, but why the word 'सर्वेषाम्' is used in the Sūtra

'हलि सर्वेषाम्' (VIII. iii. 22)? What is the significance of the term 'सर्व', had this rule been accepted by all as correct? We reply that this is done only to remove the doubts pertaining to the meaning of this Sūtra, as is remarked in the *Kāśikā* : सर्वेषां ग्रहणं शाकटायनस्यापि लोपो यथास्यादित्येवमर्थम् i.e. the term is used to denote that the elision is sanctioned by Śākaṭāyana also. As a matter of fact, had the word सर्वेषाम् not been used in the Sūtra, then a doubt might arise as to whether the elision is approved by Śākaṭāyana or not. Hence it is clear that this word has nothing to do with the universal acceptance of this Sūtra. The word सर्वेषाम् is used in the Sūtra विभाषा चत्वारिंशत्प्रभृतौ सर्वेषाम् (VI. iii. 49), and here it denotes some special numbers only.

Similarly in Sūtra यजुष्येकेषाम् (VIII.. iii. 104), the word एकेषाम् is used, where commentators explain 'एकेषामाचार्याणाम्'[10] without supplying any adequate reason for the use of this particular term. The significance of this word is not intelligible at present. In common parlance when the author says 'इत्येके' he means to say that the referred opinion is not held by him[11]. But we have already proved that Pāṇini never referred to any opinion which he thought as corrupt. Hence, we can say that this term is used to denote that this view was supported by a few teachers only, and majority of teachers had rejected this opinion, but according to Pāṇini this was correct. We welcome other suitable answers to this question. We also find the term 'एक' used in the sense of a principal tradition[12]. Like सर्वेषाम्, Pāṇini used the term सर्वत्र also in the Sūtra IV. i. 18 which is explained by Jñānendrasarasvatī as 'सर्वेषां मते'.

(G) We find that Pāṇini showed the names of his predecessors at the end of the Sūtras. but in Sūtra 'सबुद्धौ शाक-

---

[10] Cf. The *Pāninian Sikṣā* 'सर्वमुखस्थानमवर्णमित्येके' (Sūtra 9).

[11] In the *Uddyota,,* 'एके मन्यन्ते' is explained as 'अन्येषां मते' (IV i. 93).

[12] *Ślokavārttika* on VIII. ii. 80 Sūtra.

ल्यस्येतावनार्षे' (I. i. 16) the name is put down at the middle. According to the general style it should be formed as संबुद्धावितावनार्षे शाकल्यस्य. We are unable to show any reason for this peculiar construction of words.

Sometimes it takes grave consideration to understand how many Sūtras are to be ascribed to the pre-Pāṇinian teachers as in many Sūtras Pāṇini did not mention the name of the authority though they are to be deemed as the opinions of the Pre-Pāṇinian teachers. In such places Pāṇini took the help of the power of अनुवृत्ति. The Sūtras उञः and ऊँ: (I. i. 17-18) are instances of this type. These two Sūtras are attributed to Śākalya, but his name is not written with these two Sūtras, though it is present in Sūtra I. i. 16. In such cases we are compelled to take the help of the *Paribhāṣā* : व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपत्तिर्न हि सन्देहादलक्षणम्. In the aforesaid case, we may also compare the Pada-pāṭha of Śākalya, which would also give valid decision about the actual character of the views of Śākalya.

In this connection it is to be noted that there are some Sūtras, associated with the names of pre-Paṇinian teachers, whose verbal constructions are peculiar in character, as may be seen in the Sūtras 'व्योर्लघुप्रयत्नतरः शाकटायनस्य' (VIII. iii. 18), उदीचां माङो व्यतीहारे' (III. iv. 19) etc. In such cases commentators tried to support Pāṇini through various means, but real imports of such expressions are still to be determined.

(H) Pāṇini not only had cited some names of his predecessors, but also referred to some views of Grammatical Traditions by the words प्राचाम् (IV. i. 17) and उदीचाम् (IV. i. 57)[13]. According to the *Bhāṣya* on I. i. 43 these terms also denote the sense of optionality only, but it is not quite true as said before. In the *Nirukta*, Yāska showed that verbal

[13] In the commentary on the *Amarakośa* by Kṣīrasvāmin, we frequently come across many views of the प्राच्य and उदीच्य schools.

usages are naturally restricted according to the regions. It is a common fact that there happens difference of verbal usages according to the difference of country and people of a particular region become fond of a particular kind of verbal expression as is shown by Patañjali himself. Due to the above reasons we think that these two terms denote respectively Eastern and Northern traditions only. The term प्राचाम् is used in the sense of प्राग्देश (Eastern country)[14] also as may be seen in the Sūtras 'कारनाम्नि च प्राचां...' (VI. iii. 10) etc. The term उदीचाम् is never used in the sense of 'Northern region'. Sāyaṇa in his *Dhātuvṛtti* had recalled a rule of the Northern tradition as 'पद्मं हि पद्यते रुक्तं न पतेमीघवादिभिः, स्पष्टोदकारश्चोदीचांशतकारोक्तिरतो भ्रमः'. The word प्राक् is used by many authors in different case-terminations as प्राचाम्, प्राग्भिः etc. where it means the predecessors, but in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* we never meet the term used in this sense. Sometimes the import of the term प्राचाम् is not understood doubtlessly (i. e. whether it is used to denote an authority of a former teacher or a country only) as may be seen in the *Pradīpa* on VI. iii. 10.[15]

(J) Pāṇini not only recalled the views of his predecessors through their names or traditions, but also through some peculiar verbal usages such as उपदेश etc. The word, उपदेश is used in many Sūtras (I. iii. 2, VI. i. 45) etc. and different commentators supplied different explanations regarding the inner import of this term. The author of the *Prakṛyā Kaumudī* says: "धातुसूत्रगणोणादिनामलिङ्गानुशासनम्, आगमप्रत्ययादेशा उपदेशाः प्रकीर्तिताः" (I. iii. 2), while Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita holds उपदेश as 'आद्योच्चारणम्'[16]

---

[14] 'प्राचामिति देशविशेषणं न तु विकल्पार्थम्, व्याख्यानात्' *Bālamanoramā* (IV. ii 20). Similarly in the *Tatvabodhinī* we read: इह प्राचां ग्रहणं गोत्रविशेषणं. न तु प्राचामवृद्धात् (IV. i. 160) इतिवद् विकल्पार्थम् इत्यत्र व्याख्यानमेव शरणम् (II. iv. 60), A similar instance may be seen in the Sūtra एङ् प्राचांदेशे (I. i. 74) where different significances of the word प्राचां were suggested by different commentators (vide *Pradipa*).

[15] (Vide my Paper : Some peculiar Usages of Pāṇini and Their Justifications.

[16] *Siddhānta Kaumudī* on I. iiii 2.

But whatever the case may be, it cannot be ignored that the term उपदेश invariably denotes some connection with the opinions of the pre-Pāṇinian teachers[17]. Pāṇini used the term 'उपदिष्ट' in the Sūtra 'पृषोदरादीनि यथोपदिष्टम्' (VI. iii. 109). For the completion of the meaning of this Sūtra, the word शिष्ट is prescribed and this one can easily understand the deep deference of Pāṇini towards the शिष्टs, whom he regarded as the only authorities regarding the correctness of the words in which some elisions augments or changes of letters etc. occur. Pāṇini did not add the term शिष्ट in this Sūtra because he thought that उपदेश can be given by the शिष्टs only. Here it is also to be observed that though the लोक is said to be the authority on Grammar, as may be proved through the well-known propositions 'लिङ्गमशिष्यं लोकाश्रयत्वाल् लिङ्गस्य' 'सिद्धे शब्दार्थसंबन्धे लोकतोऽर्थप्रयुक्ते' etc., yet here Pāṇini directly attributed the शिष्टs as the authorities on Grammar. Some may hold this as a case of anomaly, but on proper observation we can solve the problem as follows :

According to the Pāṇinian conception, the relation of words and their senses and verbal knowledge etc. are wholly dependent on लोक and not on the learned teachers, but as for etymology or the forms of words are concerned, they are dependent on the scholars (शिष्टs). If anyone analyses the character of the term उपदिष्ट, he would obviously come to this conclusion. Pāṇini meant to say that we cannot overrule the injunctions of the शिष्टs regarding the peculiar usages like पृषोदर etc. where लोप, आगम etc. are seen but not uttered (*Bhāṣya*).

Now a point remains to be discussed. Pāṇini's composition is said to be the outcome of his intuition (उपज्ञा), hence it is obvious that his work is very much different in character in comparison to those of his predecessors. There

---

[17] Vide " The Structure of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* by Mr. Pawate ".

is no doubt that the pre-Pāṇinian grammars had some special characteristics of their own which should be comprehended before coming to know the notion of Pāṇini towards his predecessors. It is only then that we can appraise the gift of Pāṇini. We shall deal with this matter in some future article.

THE SVALPAMATSYA PURĀṆA

By MANORANJAN SHASTRI

QUITE a large number of Sanskrit works on different subjects were compiled in the ancient and medieval Assam but only a few of them are known to our scholars by name. About fifteen years ago '*The Kamrup Sanskrit Sañjīvanī Sabhā*' appointed Pt. Bhagavan Ch. Goswami to make a tour in Kamrup district and its adjacent areas in search of Sanskrit manuscripts. Though the search could not be continued for want of necessary funds, yet the learned Pandit made a considerable collection of Sanskrit manuscripts and compiled a brief descriptive catalogue of them in Assamese during that short period. Of these valuable works we have got two MSS. of *Svalpamatsya-purāṇa*—one of them collected by the learned Pandit and the other borrowed by myself from Pt. Sivanath Bujar Barua Smrititirtha of Datara, Kamrup District.

The work as far as I know, has not yet come to the notice of the scholars and none of them when dealing with purāṇas has ever mentioned it by name, not to speak of its subject matter. The famous authors of numerous digests of different parts of India have quoted various verses from different purāṇas and smṛtis but none of them, except some Assamese and Bengali writers on Dharma-Śāstra has referred to this work by name. Dāmodar Miśra, the most eminent of Assamese digest writers, has not mentioned this work by name in his prominent digest *Gaṅgājala* which was written during the 15th century A. D..Kavibhāratī, the author of the *Makhapradīpa* and Pītāmbara Siddhāntavāgiśa, the author of the *Kaumudī*, written in the latter half of the 16th century quoted dozens of verses from this work and accepted it to be an authority on Dharma; others following

him also accepted its validity without hesitation and quoted from it. Raghunandana, a prominent digest-writer of Bengal during the 16th Century A.D., mentioned the name of it and quoted from it.

We find many ślokas of this work being quoted by the pandits of this province from generation to generation and even now they are quoted to support the customary peculiarities of religious rites in the province. The work therefore contains materials of considerable value, especially for the students studying social and religious heritage of ancient Kāmarupa. Hence it deserves discussion and publication too.

In this brief paper I desire to inform the reading public of those two MSS. and the subject matter contained in them.

The MS. (A) of the *Svalpamatsya-purāṇa* was copied in 1638 Śāka but the name of the person who copied it is not mentioned here. There are 70 folios, each measuring about $1\frac{1}{4}'$ in length and $3''$ in breadth; containing about nine lines on each page and three ślokas in each line. It belonged to Pt. Sivanath Bujar Barua Smrititirtha of Datara, Kamrup Dist. The MS. (B) does not contain any reference to the copyist or the time it was copied. It has 99 folios. Each folio is $1\frac{1}{3}'$ in length and about $3''$ in breadth and contains 8 lines covering $2\frac{1}{2}$ ślokas.

Both these MSS. are written in old Assamese character and are not free from errors. Moreover, they are so worn out that in some places it has become impossible to find out proper readings.

The work is compiled in 49 chapters. All chapters except the first five deal entirely with Dharma-Śāstra materials *viz.* dāna (gift), Pratiṣṭhā, Śrāddha, Aśauca, Prāyścitta, Adbhuta (miracles) etc.

The 1st chapter contains only 8 verses of which except the 1st, 2nd and the last ślokas all are taken from the extant *Matsya Purāṇa*, chapter 2nd ślokas 19-23.

The 1st śloka says, "Let me make obescience to that Supreme Person in the form of Fish on Whom the whole universe is floating as a boat in an ocean; where all existing things like a snake for a rope are super-imposed for want of realisation of difference, and Who revealed ten forms (incarnation) Fish, Tortoise etc. with different powers (Supremacy)".[1]

The 2nd śloka says, "May the dusts of the Guru bestowed by his favour, purify and save me always in the universe. They help to understand easily the inconceivable things and remove the seeds of distress earned by one in the previous birth".[2] The 1st chapter ends with the śloka—

तडागवापी प्रतिमा प्रतिष्ठा निर्माणमेषां च सुविस्तरेण।
प्रासाद कूपादि समण्डपानां स्वल्पेह् मत्स्ये कथिता पुराणैः ॥

The colophon at the end of every chapter runs as—
इति श्रीस्वल्पमत्स्यपुराणे षट्पादपादकायां साहस्रे प्रथमोऽध्यायः।

The 1st five chapters of the work are only a summary of the 1st six chapters of the extant *Matsyapurāṇa*, in the ślokas borrowed from the same.

The rites and procedure of Dānadharma have been discussed in chapters. 6 to 13 quoting a large number of ślokas taken from different chapters of *Matsyapurāṇa*. Some of these ślokas are collected from different Purāṇas and Dharmaśāstras. The following chapters also contain a considerable number of ślokas taken from the extant *Matsyapurāṇa*. Still, it contains many ślokas which are not to be found elsewhere. The speaker in the work is God Matsya and the hearer is Maharṣi Manu.

---

[1] यस्मिन् सर्व्वंमिदं जगज्जलनिधौ पोतायितं नित्यशः
यस्मिन् विश्वमिदं विवेकविरहाद् रज्जौ भुजंगायितम्।
यो जातो दशधा विशेषविभवैर्मत्स्यादिभिर्ल्लीलया
तस्मै श्रीपुरुषोत्तमाय सततं मत्स्याय तुभ्यं नमः ॥

[2] अनेकदुर्ब्बोधसुबोधकारिणो जन्मान्तरोपार्जितदुःखहारिणः।
पुनन्तु रक्षन्तु जगतीह नित्यं गुरोःप्रसादात्चित (?)पादपांशवः ॥

The 6th Adhyāya	deals with	Dhenu-Dāna.
7th & 8th	deal with	Acala or Meru-Dāna.
9th & 10th	,,	Mahādāna.
11th	deals with	Effects of different Dānas given to the Brāhmaṇas on different auspicious occasions.
12th	,,	Qualifications of the Brāhmaṇa to whom Dānas should be given and Dāna Mantras.
13th	,,	Times when the Dānas are prohibited and the Devatās of the Dāna-Dravyas.
14th Adhyāya	lays down the	information on Vāpī, Kūpa and Taḍāga and time etc. for dedication of them.
15th	deals with	Effects rites and procedure of various Pratiṣṭhā ceremonies such as construction of the Homa-Kuṇḍa and Yāga-maṇḍapa, Brāhmaṇas who are qualified to perform Yāga and other things concerning Pratiṣṭhā.
16th	,,	The worship, Dhyāna, mantras including their ṛṣi and chandas of different Gods.
17th	,,	वृक्षप्रतिष्ठा
18th	,,	पुष्करिणीप्रतिष्ठा
19th	,,	आरामप्रतिष्ठा
20th & 21st	deal with	सेतुप्रतिष्ठा
22nd	deals with	गोप्रचारप्रतिष्ठा
23rd	,,	मण्डपप्रतिष्ठा
24th	,,	तुलसीप्रतिष्ठा
25th } 26th }	deal with	जीर्णोद्धारविधि:

27th	deals with	अद्भुत and its शान्ति.
28th & 29th	deal with	वास्तुयाग
30th	deals with	वृषोत्सर्ग
31st	,,	The Funeral ceremonies.
32nd	,,	The rites to be performed on the 4th day. (चतुर्थ्यन्हिकृत्य)
33rd	,,	The rites to be performed on the 2nd day after Śauca.
34th	,,	Sati अनुमरण
35th & 36th	deal with	Śrāddhas.
37th	deals with	एकोद्दिष्टश्राद्ध
38th	,,	सपिण्डन including some laws concerning it.
39th	,,	दैवकर्म्म
40th	,,	अशौच
41st	,,	गृहप्रवेश ceremony and worship of the book and the greatness of Brāhmaṇas.
43rd	,,	Laws of marriage including the qualities of the bride.
44th	,,	शिवरात्रिव्रत
45th	,,	Time when the Yajña ceremony may be performed, भूमिदाह & अम्बुवाची & some stotras which are to be recited in different Yāgas.
46th	,,	जन्मतिथिकृत्य including षष्ठीपूजा
47th	,,	प्रायश्चित्तविधि
48th	,,	अकाल
49th	,,	The various तिथिकृत्य such as जन्माष्टमी etc.

Some religious rites that prevailed only in this province have been codified in this work. Dāmodara Miśra of the 15th Century A. D. has not quoted from it and Pītāmbara Siddhāntavāgīśa who was a great digest-writer in ancient

Kāmarupa during the latter half of the 16th century A.D. has quoted many lines from this work and accepted it as an equal authority with other purāṇas. And Kavi Bhārati who was almost contemporary to Dāmodara Miśra has accepted its authority and quoted from it in many places in his *Makha Pradīpa*. Pītāmbara Siddhāntavāgīśa says in his *Śrāddha-Kaumudī* that Dhanañjaya and Halāyudha also have quoted ślokas from *Svalpamatsyapurāṇaṁ*.[3] Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa, a digest-writer of Bengal during the 2nd and 3rd quarters of the 12th century A.D.[4] in his *Pitṛdayitā* has mentioned its name and quoted ślokas[5] from it which are found in these MSS.

From this we may suppose that the work was compiled by some one during the 1st half of the 11th century A.D. as we should allow at least 100 years for a work to attain the same prestige as that of other Purāṇas. The work may be taken as ritualistic manual in the Smārta manner prevailing at that time in Kāmarūpa.

---

3 धनञ्जयहलायुधादिधृतस्वल्पमत्स्यवाक्यात् ।

Śrāddha-Kaumudī, Page 181.

4 Kane's *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. I Page 679.

5 इति स्वल्पमत्स्यपुराणोक्तं पठेत् ।

Pitṛdayitā Page 92.

STUDIES IN ROMANCE[1]

By D. Ojha

I

There are probably no words in the vocabulary of literary, artistic, or aesthetic criticism more common to our usage and less exact of apprehension than the words *romance*, *romantic*, *romanticism*.

According to Francis Henry Stoddard:

"The word *romance* looks back no farther than the Middle Ages when a *Romance* or *Roman* was a translation from the *Lingua Romana*, from the Latin tongue. The *Roman* was that which had come from afar, which was foreign to the language, the custom, the habit, and the nature of the day; which was brought into common life from a completer, more complex, life. The word was first given to the poems of the Troubadours and the minstrels, to acknowledge the fact that the substance of these poems had come over from the Roman tongue. The poetic romances of the Middle Ages were translations of the life of one civilization into the custom and the language of another. So the essence of the word is translation. A romance is something transferred, brought from afar. A romance is something foreign; it is something hinting of a life better, completer or nobler, than the present life; dimly known; detached from; hoped for yet never expected in the present life."

In the language of a poet like Shelley, Romance might mean:

"A skylark."

In Romance:

"We look before and after,
And pine for what is not:
Our sincerest laughter
With some pain is fraught;
Our sweetest songs are those that tell of saddest thought."

According to Sismondi, near about the tenth century A. D., we find Europe sunk in utter ignorance and bar-

[1] Read before the Allahabad Branch of the English Association.

barism. All the contributions of Greece and Rome had been destroyed by the invasion of the Barbarians. People had sunk to the lowest level of degradation. The feudal system tended to degrade men rather than raise their intellectual and moral level. From the fifth to the tenth century various races, always new, were mingled without being confounded. Each village, each hamlet, contained some Teutonic Conqueror with his barbarain soldiers, and a number of vassals, the remains of the vanquished people. The terms, upon which they lived, were those of contempt on one side and hatred on the other. There was no confidence or trust between them. Equally ignorant of every principle of general grammar, they never thought of studying the language of their enemies; but accustomed themselves, merely to the mutual jargon in which they sought to carry on an intercourse.

According to both Dozy and Ameer Ali, almost everybody, in Spain under the Saracens at this period, knew how to read and write, whilst in Christian Europe save and except the clergy, even persons belonging to the highest ranks were wholly ignorant.

In the *Introduction to Mediaeval Romance* A. B. Taylor says: We find that in France the Church in the Mediaeval Period used the Latin Language. So the basis of the French language was Latin; but several centuries of unchecked change in spelling, pronunciation, and meaning, together with continual incorporations of Celtic and particularly Germanic elements had resulted in very wide divergence from the Latin language employed by the Church. The word "romans" was therefore employed to differentiate this changed and everchanging language of the people from that of the Church. Thus came into existence in time, the vulgar or vernacular language and developed into French, Spanish, Italian; etc.

When the vernacular language came to be used as a medium of literature, first of all in poems which claimed

to relate history, these works were called "romans". This term is still used in France for what is called the novel, and its other form "romance", is employed to designate the whole field of imagniative fiction.

Though written and accepted as history, most mediaeval romance is pure fiction, and must be regarded as such in all discussions of its origin and characteristics. The period of mediaeval romance extends from the twelfth to the fifteenth century. The most active period of romance was 1150-1250, and romances composed later were frequently mere remodellings of earlier versions at greater length, generally also of inferior merit.

The best romances—those composed by educated poets for the higher classes—arose only during the fourteenth century. For it was not until then that English replaced French as the national language of England. Before mediaeval romance became a literature of absorbing interest, there was in existence Heroic poetry. It voices the opinions not of the author as an individual, but of the nation as a whole; the virtues, vices, crimes portrayed, represent the ethical code of the nation and the character of the hero represents the ideals of the nations, such as you meet within Achilles, Ulysses and Aeneas, Beowulf and Roland; whereas Mediaeval romance reflects the views of limited classes or families, such as you find in the feudal period in France and other countries.

In heroic poetry, the theme and characters alone are sufficient to stir the imagination of an audience; the poet need not rely on sensational episodes to win attention. Heroic poetry is characterised by simplicity and naturalness, romance by fantasy and exaggeration.

Romance is young, and men in the Middle Ages are child-like, Romance is an uncritical love of wonders; and the Middle Ages believed nearly everything they heard and everything they read. Pliny says that the traveller who

takes a myrtle staff will never feel tired. No one cares to test it. Is not Pliny's word good enough? Albertus Magnus says, a woman will confess all her secrets, if a frog's tongue is laid on her heart, as she sleeps; but few men stirred out to catch a frog. Doubt was only possible if the authority was not sufficiently antique.

From Romance, whether in the twelfth century or the twentieth century, the audience demands the uncommon and the sensational. If the hero rescues from drowning the maiden whom fate has destined for his bride, it must be during a storm or close to a weir, or in a shark-infected bay. If the heroine is ensnared by a villain, a miscellaneous assortment of satellite villains must be introduced, so that the hero will not be faced by the disgraceful position of having only one assailant. The key-note of all romance is contained in two statements made by the hero in *Huan of Bordeaux*:

> "Any adventure that I might hear of, though it were never so perilous, that I should ever eschew it for fear of death", and "I departed out of France for no other thing but to seek strange adventures."

The best mediaeval romances were inspired by lofty ideals of loyalty, service, chastity, and self-sacrifice.

In a period when few could read, and when an author could reach the public only through oral recitation, verse was the natural medium of literature, whether its object was to instruct or to entertain. The imagination was further stirred if the verses were chanted to the accompaniment of a harp or other musical instrument:

"The harp his sole remaining joy
Was carried by an orphan boy".

The feudal system, in which every lord, enjoying the most complete independence, lived in his own castle, convinced that God was his only judge and master, afforded great scope for Romance and the genius of Troubadours.

Their compositions were entirely lyrical and not epic. They sang, but they did not recite; and chivalry amongst them existed in gallantry and sentiment. They were acquainted with all the rules of chivalry, on which their compositions were modelled.

On the most solemn occasions in the disputes for glory in the games, called *Tensons*, when two Troubadours combated in verse, before illustrious princes or before the courts of love, they were called upon to discuss questions of the most scrupulous delicacy and the most disinterested gallantry.

It is in these *Tensons* that bravery becomes disinterested, and that love is exhibited pure, delicate and tender; that homage to woman becomes a species of worship, and that a respect for truth is an article in the creed of honour. This delicacy of sentiment amongst the Troubadours and this mysticism of love, have a very intimate connection with the poetry of the Arabians and the manners of the East. The songs in which an Arab celebrates his love, breathe the same spirit of adoration and of worship which we find in the poets of chivalry, and the most beautiful of Persian Ghaziles and the Arabian Cassides seem to be translations of the verses or songs of the Provençals.

This beautiful language was exclusively employed, for a long time in those compositions to which it was so peculiarly appropriate—in amatory and martial songs. If the feudal lord sat in his court of justice with his peers around him, when he dispensed justice, the lady of the castle also had her court of love, consisting of young, beautiful, and lively women. A new career was opened to those who dared the combat, not of arms but of verse and the name of *Tenson* which was given to these dramatic skirmishes, in fact signified a contest. Many of the ladies who sat in the Court of Love, were able themselves to reply to the verses which they inspired and in the expression of sentiment, a tenderer and

more delicate inspiration naturally endowed the productions of these poetesses with a more lyrical character.

Below is given a song by Bertrand de Born. He was attached to Helen, the sister of King Richard. This song places before us the real knight of former times, all busied in war and the chase, the labour and the delight of men of that age, successively appealing to everything that is dear to him in life, to everything which has been the study of his youth, of his riper age, and yet esteeming them all light in comparison with love.

"I cannot hide from thee, how much I fear
The whispers breathed by flatterers in thine ear,
Against my faith. But turn not, Oh! I pray,
That heart so true, so faithful, so sincere,
So humble, and so frank, to me so dear,
Oh lady! turn it not from me away.

So may I lose my hawk, ere he can spring,
Borne from my hand by some bold falcon's wing,
Mangled and torn before my very eye,
If every word thou utterest does not bring
More joy to me than fortune's favouring,
Or all the bliss another's love might buy.

So with my shield on neck, mid storm and rain,
With vizor blinding me and shortened rein,
And stirrups far too long, so may I ride,
So may my trotting charger give me pain,
So may the ostler treat me with disdain,
As they who tell those tales have grossly lied.

When I approach the gaming board to play,
May I not turn a penny all the day,
Or may the board be shut, the dice untrue,
If the truth dwell not in me, when I say
No other fair e'er wiled my heart way,
From her I've long desired and loved from you.

Or, prisoner to some noble may I fill
Together with three more some dungeon chill
Unto each other odious company;
Let master, servants, porters try their skill,
And use me for a target if they will,
If ever I have loved aught else but thee.

So may another knight make love to you,
And so may I be puzzled what to do;
So may I be calmed'mid ocean wide;
May the king's porter beat me black and blue.
And may I fly ere I the battle view,
As they, that slander me, have grossly lied."

The Troubadours are divided into two very distinct classes : the Troubadours, and the Jongleurs or minstrels. The Troubadours were those, who like poets composed new poems. They often themselves sang their Treuves in courts and festivals, but more frequently these were sung by their jongleurs. It was the duty of the latter, who were altogether of an inferior rank, to entertain the companies into which they were admitted, by the recitation of tales and verses which they had learned, and which they accompanied on different instruments, and even by juggling tricks and buffoonery.

Burney, the author of *History of Music* and the *Essai sur la Musique*, gives a fragment, in which all the accomplishments of a jongleur are catalogued :

"All the minstrel art I know;
I the viol well can play;
I the pipe and syrinx blow,
Harp and gigue my hand obey.

Psaltry, symphony and rote,
Help to charm the listening throng,
And Armonia lends its note
While I warble forth my song.

I have tales and fables plenty,
Satires, past'rals, full of sport,
Songs to vielle I've more than twenty,
Ditties, too of every sort.

I from lovers tokens bear,
I can flowery chaplets weave,
Amorous belts can well prepare,
And with courteous speech deceive." (Tr.)

The jongleur must know how Love runs and flies, how he goes naked and unclothed, and how he repulses justice

with his keen darts, and his two arrows, one of which is made of dazzling gold, and the other of steel, which inflicts wounds so deep that they cannot be healed. He must learn the ordinances of love, its privileges and remedies; and be able to explain its different degrees; how rapid its pace, on what it lives; how it departs; the deceptions it then exercises; and how it destroys its worshippers. No mean accomplishments indeed!

II

The Hellenic Ideal of beauty was almost invariably realised in the male form. The Greeks of the classical period disdained woman, who was for them inseparably connected with base sensuality. To the Greek mind woman was the embodiment of the dark side of love, and it was merely the logical conclusion of this conception, when, at a later period, she was regarded as the devil's tool.

In intercourse with women man dimly felt the vague elementary condition from which he had struggled hard to emerge, and fled to the more familiar companions of his own sex.

> "Would not love between man and man" asks Plato "deliver him from the basely sensual, strengthen his spirituality and lead to the Gods".

Aeschylus, the apostle of man's supremacy, in his Greek tragedy of *Orestes*, represents the final victory of man over women in the following lines:

> "Not to the mother is the child indebted
> For life; she tends and guards the kindling spark
> The father lighted: she but holds his pledge."

Erinays accept meekly the decision of the virgin goddess Athene but record their protest, saying:

> "Thus thou destroy'st the gods of ancient time".

The birth of Christianity gave importance to the individual and his soul, which is in need of salvation. In the course of time the Church built up a great power, so much so that the Church was considered God. "The Church is God" became a fact. The profoundest wisdom the greatest power, were hers; the loftiest ideal was realised as it had never been realised before. The priest alone had all knowledge, for he had the doctrine of salvation. For a thousand years the Church ruled Europe. The power of the Church became supreme but the religion of Christ was lost, man had become a stranger to his own soul. It was at this stage that the Moors in Spain and the Crusades, the contact of East with West, brought light and learning, a new idea of life to Europe. A unique conception of chivalry and love spread like wild fire in Southern Europe and Provence became the torch-bearer of Romance to Europe.

The fundamental sources of antiquity had been sensuality and asceticism, the elements of the Middle Ages abstract thought and historical faith; now emotion was to become the principal factor, It welled up in the soul and dominated all life. For the first time the system of ecclesiastical values was confronted by something novel, which was not like the old Teutonic ideal of the perfect warrior, tainted by barbarism, but may be described as the system of mundane Court Values. The new ideal of *pretze valore bentates* (worth, value and beauty) of *Canalaria* and *Cortizia* (Chivalry and Courtesy) was upheld in Provence. Four worldly virtues, wisdom, Courtly manners, honesty and self-restraint were contrasted with the ecclesiastical cardinal virtues. The Courts of the princes become centres of new life and art. Woman, who had heretofore been excluded from male society was all at once transferred to the very centre of being; for her sake men controlled their brutal tempers and exerted themselves to please by good manners, taste and art. She whom the Church had done everything

to depreciate, who had been denied a soul at the Council of Macon (in the sixth century), had become the very vessel of the soul : man looked up to her and bent his knee before the newly created goddess.

The Arabians exercised a considerable influence over the literature of Europe in the Middle Ages, and the Troubadours drank deep at the fountain of Arabic literature. The Arabians seemed to unite in themselves the advantages of all the nations whom they had conquered.

Thus wrote Sismondi : "It may justly be asserted that the greatest characteristic of oriental taste is an abuse of the imagination and of the intellect. The Arabs despised the poetry of the Greeks, which to them appeared timid, cold and constrained.........The object of the Arabians was always to make a brilliant use of the boldest and the most gigantic images. They sought to astonish the reader by the abruptness of their expression; and they burdened their compositions with riches, under the *idea* that nothing which was beautiful could be superfluous." The Moors in Spain built a mighty Civilization in several spheres of life. According to Stanley Lane-Poole, the professors and teachers of Cordova, "made her the centre of European culture; students would come from all parts of Europe to study under her famous doctors.....Every branch of Science including medicine was seriously studied there. Astronomy, geography, chemistry, natural history—all were studied with ardour at Cordova; and as for the graces of literature there never was a time in Europe when poetry became so much the speech of everybody, when people of all ranks composed those Arabic verses, which perhaps suggested models for the ballads and Conzonettes of the Spanish minstrels and the troubadours of Provence and Italy......The whole Moslem world seemed given over to the Muses; Khalifs and boatmen turned verses, and sang of the loveliness of the cities of Andalusia, the murmer of her rivers, the beautiful nights beneath her tranquil stars, and the delights of love and wine, of jovial Company and stolen meetings with the lady whose cunning eyebrows had bewitched the singers."

Joseph Hell says in his *Arab Civilization*[2] :

"Sheer Joy in the beauty of words and their collocations is one of the dominant characteristics of the Arab. Verses countless in number flew from lip, admired by high and low alike, not only for their poetical

---

[2] Translated from the German by S. Khuda Bukhsh.

contents but for their exquisite diction. At all times and in all countries, wherever Arabic is spoken, intense, overpowering has been this passion for poetry. In Spain it reached its culminating point. From king to peasant, all cultivated the art of improvisation. .... A mere list of Spanish Arab poets would make a volume."

For the reception of knowledge, no doubt, the soil of Cordova was exceedingly congenial. There, a consuming love of books and libraries was the striking characteristic of the people. The royal library consisted of 400,000 volumes.

In Cordova, for the first time, we observe how the Arabs, by sheer superiority, extended and diffused their language. The patrician Alvar of Cordova, complains that Christian read the poetry and *ramances* of the Arabs.

The ancient Muslim was not at all narrow-minded. He possessed a liberal outlook. This was due mainly to the fact that he made all knowledge his province from whatever sources it came. Being in the position of a master, he did not possess a slave mentality. He absorbed in himself the learning of all countries. This was possible, not because of the unity of the Caliphate, as some people suggest, but because of the unity of language and religion. Arabic was not only the language of worship, it was also the medium of instruction. Every book that was written in the East or the West was the common possession of all.

Everyone is acquainted with the *Arabian Nights'* entertainments. This prodigious collection is not confined merely to books, but forms the treasure of a numerous class of men and women, who throughout the whole extent of the Mohammeden dominion, in Turkey, Persia, and even to the extremity of India, find a livelihood in reciting these tales to crowds who delight to forget, in the pleasing dreams of imagination, the melancholy feelings of the present.

These story-tellers are the masters of Europe in the art of producing, sustaining and increasingly varying the

interest of this kind of fiction. It is from them that Europe has derived that intoxication of love, that tenderness, and delicacy of sentiment and that reverential awe of women, by turns slaves and divinities, which have operated so powerfully in the chivalrous feelings of Europe. Their effects are traced in all the literature of the South, which owes to this cause its mental character. From the ninth to the fourteenth century Europe drew its inspiration in literature from Islam. The Universities of Spain became the torch-bearer of Europe in every realm of intellectual activities. Readers of *A Mid-Summer Night's Dream* are familiar with Oberon, King of the Fairies. Mr. S. Lee, in his Introduction *Duke of Huon of Burdeaux* says :[3]

> "The Oberon of the great poet's fairy-comedy, although he is set in a butterfly environment, still possesses some features very similar to those of the romantic fairy king....The mediaeval fairy dwells in the East; his kingdom is situated somewhere to the east of Jerusalem, to the far-reaching district that was known to mediaeval writers under the genric name of India...Titania, further, tells her husband how the mother of her page-boy gossiped at her side, in their home in the spiced Indian air, by night" (II i. 124). And it will be remembered that an Indian boy causes the jealousy of Oberon.

N. M. Penzer in his introduction (p. xxxiv) to *The Ocean of Story—Somdeva's Kathā-Sarita Sāgara* writes : "India is indeed the home of story-telling. It was from here that the Persians learned the art, and passed it on to the Arabians. From the Middle East the tales found their way to Constantinople and Venice, and finally appeared in his pages of Boccacoio, Chaucer and La fontaine." It was not until Benfey wrote his famous introduction to the *Pañcatantra* that we began to realise what a great debt the Western tales owed to the East.

This clearly shows that India was the seat of old remances that passing through various countries, including

[3] Early English Text Society Pub. Part I, Page 50.

Greece, Persia, Arabia and Moorish Spain entered Europe as a result of the Crusades mainly and the untiring zeal of students who flocked to Spanish Universities for new knowledge at great personal risks and whose life Dr. Samuel Johnson thus sums up:

> "There mark what ills the scholar's life assail,
> Toil, envy, want, the patron, and the gaol."

The French who always accounted elegance and easiness of style to be the essence of poetry, availed themselves with eagerness, of every tale of gallantry, and every adventure and anecdote, which could awaken curiosity or excite mirth. A collection of Indian tales, entitled *Dolopathos or the King and the Seven Wise Men*, having been translated into Latin, about the tenth or eleventh century, was the first storehouse of the Story-tellers. Who is not acquainted with the *Kathā Sarita Sāgara*, the ocean of stories, from which all nations have borrowed their stories?

The French according to Sismondi certainly possessed above every other nation of modern times in Europe an inventive spirit. They were the inventors of *fabliaux* or tales of amusement. To narrate with neatness, cleanness, and a degree of simplicity, to which at the same time elegance, precision of expression and a mixture of abstract sentiment are united, appeared to the French, at that time, to be the essence of the poetical art. The Romance of the Rose, and its numberless imitations, are of this class. But the Fabliaux have been represented as treasures of invention, originality, simplicity, and gaiety. The dictates of delicacy, decency and modesty, were little respected in the good old times; and the Trouvires, to excite the gaiety of the knights and ladies who received them at their courts, would often amuse them with very licentious wit. The grossness of their language was esteemed pleasantry, and the most dissolute manners were the most inviting subjects of their verse.

The brutality and coarseness of the Crusaders can scarcely be wondered at when we bear in mind the manners and habits in their original homes. After a feast in the hall, the baron and his knights lay scattered about helpless from the extent of their potations and reclining on the laps of their women; in the midst stood a jongleur or minstrel, alternately singing and exciting their mirth with coarse and brutal jests. In the reign of Stephen of England, the amusements of the hall were varied with the torture of captured enemies. We need not be surprised that the performances of the jongleurs before ladies were indecent, for the ladies themselves were by no means refined.[4]

Romance songs brought into existence a great spirit of adventure to see other and strange lands. This was one of the origins of the Crusades. Peace has its advantages; but wars have no less. The Christian knights came into conflict and also contact with the Saracens, at the time of the Crusades.

The superior civilization of the Saracens could not fail to humanise the mind and heart of the Christian knight and on several occasions they were touched with the nobility and magnanimity of their opponents.

Not infrequently the Saracens behaved far more generously than the Christian armies. In A. D. 1221, "the Sultan of Egypt of his own free will restored the Lord's Cross, permitted the Christians to leave Egypt with all their belongings and commanded all prisoners to be set free, so that at that time 30,000 captives were released. He also commanded his subjects to sell food to the rich and give alms to the poor and the sick."

The Arabian tales, which were transmitted by the Moors to the Castilians and by the latter to the French, were in their turn versified. Even the Romantic adventures

---

[4] Vide Wright's *Homes of Their Days*, Fosbrooke's *British Monachism*, and Samuelson's *History of Drink*.

of the Provençal knights and Troubadours, furnished the story-tellers with subjects for their tales. But, above all, the anecdotes which they collected in the towns and castles of France; the adventures of lovers; the tricks which were played upon the jealousy and credulity of husbands the gallantries of priests, and the disorders of convents supplied the reciters of tales with inexhaustible materials for their ludicrous narratives. These were treasures common to them all.

When Europe was sunk in utter barbarism, Baghdad, Cordova and Granada became alternately great centres of of civilization which was destined at no distant date to humanise Europe.

In the reign of Abdur Rahman an Nasir according to Ameer Ali: "The great sovereigns of Europe courted his alliance and the Emperor of Constantinople, and the kings of Germany, France and Italy all sent him ambassadors".

In Baghdad as well as in the provincial towns were numerous richly endowed colleges, hospitals and infirmaries for both sexes.

In the time of Mansur we hear of two royal princesses (his cousins) going to the Byzantine war clad in mail, in performance of a vow taken during the struggle with Merwan. In Rashid's time, too, we find how Arab maidens went to fight on horsebacks and commanded troops. In Baghdad under Rashid and Mamun we read of ladies holding their own against men in culture and wit, taking part in poetical recitation, and enlivening society by their grace and accomplishments. The empress Zubaida was a gifted woman and an accomplished poetess.

A little later Cordova became the abode of culture, of learning and arts, of industry and commerce. It was the home where chivalry received its first nourishment. Chivalry is innate in the Arab character but its rules and principles, the punctilious code of honour, the kinghtly polish,

the courtliness all of which were so assiduously cultivated afterwards in the kingdom of Granada, came into prominence under an- Nasir and his son. According to Reinaud, " it was at this period that the chivalrous ideas commenced to develop themselves joined to an exalted sense of honour and respect for the feeble sex ."

According to Viardot, " Chivalry with all its institutions such as came later into existence among the Christian nations of the West, flourished among the Saracens in the time of an-Nasir, Hakam, and al-Mansur. Here came foreign knights under guarantee of peace and protection to break lance with Saracen cavaliers ". The Saracen lady was an undisguised spectator at the frequent jousts and tournaments, which enlivened the capital, and her presence at the public festivals lent a charm and fascination to the scenes. The dignified association of the sexes gave rise to a delicacy of sentiment and refinement of manners, of which the domiciled Moslem of India in the present day can have but a faint conception ; the polished courtesy and exalted sentiment of honour, which distinguished the Arab cavaliers to the very end of their empire in Spain, might have graced a Bayard or a Sidney.

When the empress queen of Alfonso VII was besieged in the Castle of Azece, in 1139, she reproached the Moslem cavaliers for their want of courtesy and courage in attacking a fortress defended by a female. They acknowledged the justice of the rebuke and only requested that she would condescend to show herself to them from her palace when the Moorish cavalry, after paying their obeisance to her in the most respectful manner, instantly raised the siege and departed.

Among the Saracens, the ten qualities essential to a true knight were " piety, valour, courtesy, prowess, the gifts of poetry and eloquence and dexterity in the management of the horse, the sword, lance, and bow ".

According To Ameer Ali : "After the fall of Cordova, chivalry found a congenial home at Granada, where it attained its highest development. In the capital of the Caliphs, women occupied a pre-eminent position, mingled freely in the society or men, and by their presence enlivened the fetes, tourneys, and the perfectual succession of spectacles which delighted the Granadans. Much of the chivalrous spirit and gallantry for which the Saracens of Granada were conspicuous was undoubtedly due to the ennobling influence of Women. The Arab cavalier entered the lists or went to war with some device emblazened on his arms, either a heart pierced with darts, a star directing a vessel or the initial letter of the name of the lady-love. The knights contended openly in her presence for the prize of valour, and often joined her in the graceful dance of the zambra. It is said that the women were handsome, mostly of a middle stature, witty, and brilliant in conversations. Their dress consisted of costly robes of the finest linen, silk or cotton with a girdle and kerchief."

The historain, Ibn-ul-Khātib, characterises their "*Luxury* of dress" as madness. Perfumes were used to a lavish extent, and women, especially ladies of rank, were passionately fond of decorating themselves with hyacinth, chrysolites, emeralds, and other gems together with ornaments of gold and precious stones ; and such was the variegated splendour of their appearance when in the mosques, that they have been compared to "the flowers of spring in a beautiful meadow."

Francis Henry Stoddard in his *The Evolution of the English Novel* says :

"The theory of development that I set forth is that progress in speech, in literature, in methods religious, educational and political, in theories of the relation of the individual to his life work and life duty, has always been from the expression of the external form, from the consideration of the external characteristics, from the suggestion of the external remedies for evils and rewards for endeavour, to the expression of the abstract thought beneath the external form, to the consideration of the internal character which finds embodiment in the external characteristics, to study into the causes of evil, and to the satisfaction of the soul with duty done in the place of external reward of endeavour. It is a progress that advances from the physical to the intellectual, from the carnal to the spiritual. I shall endeavour to apply this theory to the novel with intent to suggest that such development

of expression as we find in form of novels advances from the depiction of far off occurrences and adventures to the narration and representation of contemporaneous, immediate domestic occurences; and, finally, to the presentation of conflicts of the mind and soul beneath the external manifestations. If the theory is true, we may expect to find at the beginning of novel expression in a wild romance, and at its end an introspective study into motive."

According to Boehme, a great mystic, a man shows different degrees of development. He compares the world "to such a fruit as a plum or an apple and says of its inhabitants that some are rind-men, some pulp-men and others core or kernel-men. All have the same faculties, but, while the first live only on the surface of things, the last have got into touch with the central life within."

In the year 1932, I read a paper on Romanticism before the Allahabad branch of the English Association. I defined Romance, Romanticism and Mysticism in the following words:

"Love is the essence of Romance, Romanticism and Mysticism. None of these can exist without love. With the advent of love in the body, Romance begins; when the mind is subject to the influence of love, Romanticism commences, and with the awakening of love in the soul, Mysticism results." "I have said that love is the essence of Romance, Romanticism and Mysticism; Surely love; but not ordinary love. Only when abnormal extra-ordinary love enters the body, the mind and the soul, then alone one realises the true significance of Romance, Romanticism and Mysticism."

People under the influence of Romance are the rind-men. They exhibit the first abnormal condition and prepare themselves to ascend the first step of the ladder.

III

With this background, I shall now present the origin and development of Romance. The child that sets its heart to obtain an object, uses all means, fair or foul, to secure it and ultimately succeeds in its effort. Wordsworth expressed this truth, when he said, " The child is the father of man." As the child grows up, its interest in another personality begins to develop in it and its *I-Ego* begins to make a move towards a *you-Ego*. Romance, thus, in its

first stage is the worship of the body of a *you-Ego* and at the last stage it is the sublimation of the body of the *I-Ego*: in fact the merging of the *I-Ego* into the *you-Ego*; and Love, all along is the bridge between the *I-Ego* and the *you-Ego*. And wherever there is love, there is sacrifice. The characteristic of sacrifice is that it brings into prominence all the noble qualities of a person. With the awakening, therefore, of a sense of beauty, love springs, and love's quality is sacrifice, which in its turn, brings into existence all those noble qualities of loyalty and service, which are the distinguishing marks of Romance.

Just before the commencement of the Middle Ages, when the Graeco-Roman civilization was dead and Christianity was making headway, Saint Bernard thus expounds the four stages or grades (gradus) of love:

"Love is a natural affection, one of the four—love, fear, joy and sorrow. As it exists by nature, it should diligently serve the Author of nature first of all. But as nature is frail and weak, love is compelled by necessity first to serve itself. This is carnal love, whereby, above everything, man loves himself for his own sake. It is not set forth by precept, but is rooted in nature; for who hates his own flesh? As love becomes more ready and profuse, it is not content with the channel of necessity, but will pour forth and overspread the broad fields of pleasure. At once the overflow is bridled by the command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." This is just and needful, lest what is part of nature should have no part in grace. A man may concede to himself what he will, so long as he is mindful to provide the same for his neighbour. The bridle of temperance is imposed on thee O man, out of the law of life and discipline, in order that thou shouldst not follow thy desires, nor with the good things of nature serve the enemy of the soul, which is just. If thou wilt turn away from thy pleasures and be content with food and raiment, little by little, it will not so burden thee to keep thy love from carnal desires, which was against the soul. Thy love will be temperate and righteous when what is withdrawn from its own pleasures is not denied to its brother's need. This carnal love becomes social when extended to one's kind.....How can one love his neighbour purely who does not love God? God makes Himself loved. He who makes all things good. He who founded nature, so made it that it should always need to be sustained by Him.....So now for his own interest he

love God—Love's second grace; but does not yet love God for God's sake........At length God's sweetness, rather than human need, draws the man to love Him....That is the third grade of love, when God is loved for Himself. Happy is he who attains to the fourth grade, where man loves himself only on account of God..........Then not our need or happiness, but His will, will be fulfilled in us.... O pure and purged intention of the will, in which nothing of its own is mingled? This is to be made God (deificari)."

A. M. A. Shushtery in his *Ontlines of Islamic Culture* thus writes regarding Physical Beauty and Love:

"Beauty is appreciated by human beings in everything. There is beauty, in body, in voice, in movement, in character, in dress, in the construction of building, in speech and in nature. Each nation has its own standard of beauty.......The Arab conception of beauty has influenced early Muslim poets and Moghal conception has found its way into Iranian poetry when that nation ruled in central Asia and India."

The Arab conception includes the following ideas:

1. Large and long almond-shaped eyes;
2. intense blackness of the pupil of the eye and whiteness of the white part. A woman possessing such an eye is called Huri or Hur;
3. long, and brilliant eye-lashes;
4. arch-shaped eye-brows;
5. wide, white and clear fore-head;
6. a strait nose;
7. a small and well-shaped mouth;
8. red lips;
9. white well-arranged teeth;
10. small and well-proportioned pomegranate-like breasts;
11. a slender waist;
12. wide and large lips;
13. small hands and feet;
14. fingers like an ivory pen;
15. tapering nails;
16. deep black, but soft hair;
17. and round neck, fore-arms and ankles.

Iranians admire a white face with rosy cheeks, contrasted with deep black hairs. But Arab poets have praised an olive oil or mild white colour of the face and black eyes (pupil), while Indian poets praise golden colour. Amongst Arab poets, the lover is always a man and the beloved a woman, while Indian poets make a woman love a man. Iranian poets seldom make any reference to either sex. Muslim literature contains a large number of words for love with but slight changes in their meaning. For example, *Mohabbat*, *Movadhat*, *Hava* (inclination), *Ishaq* (intense attachment—the literal meaning of the word being creeper), *Itaqah*, *Shagaf*, *Shiftagi*, *Walah*, *Vaerftagi*, *Mehr*. The effect of lyric poetry was deep in Muslim society, specially among the Arabs, and the Iranians. The popular heroes and heroines of love referred to by Muslim poets are: Yusuf (Joseph) and Zulekha of the Hebrew legend, who are mentioned in the Quran; Majnu and Laila (Arab); Khusroe and Shirin (Iranian); Wameq and Uzra (Iranian); Farhad and Shirin (Iranian); and Salman and Absal (Iranian); Vais and Ramin (Iranian); Khizir Khan and Deval Devi (Indian); Nala and Damayanti (Indi'n); and Sulma (Arab); ete.

"Truth is Beauty, Beauty Truth," wrote Keats. I wonder how he, being such a great votary of love, forgot Love to make a Trinity. Love, Truth and Beauty go together. Where there is Beauty, there is Love; where there is Love, there is Truth.

This Nicolette has possessed the heart of her lover Aucassin.[5] But why? because:

"She had fair hair with white curls, and her eyes blue-grey and laughing, and her face well-featured, and her nose well-set, and

[5] Aucassin when bidden by the Censorial Church to choose between his mistress and heaven, declares he will go to hell: "Thither go the gold and the silver, and the fail and the grey, and thither too go harpers and ministrels and the kings of the world. With these will I go, so that I have Nicolette, my most sweet friend, with me."

her lips redder than cherry or rose in summertide, and her teeth white and little, and her breasts were hard, lifting her robe as if they had been two walnuts, and so, slim she was from flank to flank that you might have clasped her within your two hands; and the daisy-flowers broken by her toes, as they fell across the arch of her foot, were right black against her feet and legs—so white was the maid."

Is not this Nicolette the very ecstasy of a lover's dream? Surely there is no such word as " *hyperbole* " in the dictionary of romance. Hyperbole is its very essence. Surely, Raimon of Toulouse is correct when he says : " In the kingdom of love folly rules and not sense."

This is like the surprise of Shakespeare's Puck :

"Lord what fools these mortals be!"

When Alexander came to Archialus, he read on the statue of the Assyrian king : " Sardannpalus built Archialus and Tarsus on the same day ; but thou, stranger, eat, drink and make love ; all else is not worth that ". The germ of the latter day ' the lay of Aristotle' may be traced to this Epicurean king's advice.

Of the great power of love, the lay of Aristotle furnishes a great example. In the Middle Ages, antiquity was represented in the garb of chivalry. The people of that day could scarcely comprehend, how could there have existed manners and a mode of life different from their own. Ancient Greece, moreover was only known to the people of the West, through the medium of the Arabians. The lay of Aristotle was, in all probability, itself of eastern origin ; for that philosopher, and his disciple, Alexander, were in the number of those Greeks, whose praises the Arabians had the greatest pleasure in celebrating.

Alexander, according to the poet Henry d'Audeley, is arrested by love, in the midst of his conquests. All his knights and soldiers lament over his inactivity.

"But of this he took no care;
For he found his love so fair."

No one dares to inform Alexander of the discontent of his army. His master, Aristotle, reproaches the conquerer of the world with forgetting himself for love. Alexander, touched with these reproaches, promises to forsake his mistress, and remains some days without seeing her:

"But her pleasant memory
Did not, with her presence, flee;
Love recalls each lovely grace.
Her sweet manner, her fair face
In whose features you could trace,
Nought of malice or of ill;
Her bright forehead, like some chill
And crystal fountain, her fine form,
Fair hair, and mouth, with beauty warm;
How, in mischief's name, he cries,
Can I, live, without this prize?"

At last Alenxander returns to her and relates how he had been reprimanded by his master. The lady swears to revenge herself, and to make Aristotle himself bow to the power of her charms. She seeks him in the garden where he is studying, and employs all the arts of coquetry to seduce him. The philosopher in vain calls to mind his age, his grey head, and his discoloured and meagre features. He perceives that he has devoted himself uselessly to study. He declares himself her slave. She does not scold him but thus punishes him for his rebellious counsels, which he had given to his pupil:

"Said the lady, you must bring
Yourself to do another thing;
If indeed, you feel love's fire,
You must do what I desire;
Know then, that it is my pride
This day, on your back to ride,
Through the grass and garden gay;
If you answer not with nay,
I will straightway saddle you,
That will be the best to do."

The Philosopher falls on all fours and suffers her to place a saddle on his back. The lady mounts, and guides him, with a string of roses, to the foot of the tower, where Alexander is waiting for her and where he witnesses the triumph of love over " the most skilful clerk in all the world."

How well has Jami, the great Persian poet of the thirteenth century (1207-1273) said :

در مکتب عشق تو خرد با همه دانش
چون طفل نو آموز نداند الف و بے

" In thy school of love, reason with all its wisdom is like a ehild just beginning the alphabet does not know even A and B."

How beautiful again, and how full of treachery is the story of Tristan and Iseult ?

Tristan who had seen the beautifal Iseult, " goes to the king of Ireland with Mark's (his uncle's) demand for Iseult's hand. Tristan secures Iseult and both start for home. In the way both fall in love : " Fair Iseult, what is troubling you "? says Tristan. " What I know, that troubles me ; what I see, the heaven and sea, that weighs me ; body and life are heavy ", replies Iseult. They leaned towards each other ; bright eyes began to fill from the heart's spring ; her head sank, his arm sustained her ;...... " Ah ! sweet, tell me ; what is it ?" Answered love's feather-play, Iseult : " Love is my need, love is my pain". He answered painfully; " Fair Iseult, it is the rude wind and sea". " No no, it is not wind or sea ; love is my pain". " Beauty, so with me !" "Love and you make my need." "Heart's lady, dear Iseult, you and the love of you have seized me. I am dazed. I cannot find myself. All the world has become naught, save thee alone".

" Sir, so is it with me."

They loved, and in each other saw one mind, one heart, one will. Hereafter, they practised every kind of treachery to escape Mark,

Arthurian romances and Guillau me de Lorris's portion of the *Roman de la Rose* both illustrate love principles.

Love may slay the lover to be or gladden him—"*le cures est voste, nou pas miens*", says the lover to love, and you shall do with it as you will.

To his devotee, Love imparts his rules and counsels: "The lover must abjure *vilanie*, and foul and slanderous speech—the opposite of courtesy. Pride also must be abandoned. He should attire himself seemingly, and show cheerfulness; he must be niggardly in nothing; his heart must be given utterly to one; he shall undergo toils and endure griefs without complaint; in absence he will always think of the beloved, sighing for her, keeping his love aflame; he will be bashful, confused and blushing in her presence; at night he will toss and weep for love of her, and dream dreams of passionate delight; then wakeful, he will rise and wander near her dwelling, but will not be seen—nor will he forget to be generous to her waiting-maid. All this will make the lover pale and lean. To aid him to endure these agonics, will come Hope with her gentle healings, and Fond-thought, and sweet-speech of the beloved with a wise confidant and sweet-sight of her dwelling, may be of herself."

Parzival, the brave man, is slowly made wise, in his search for "that *thing*, that magic dish, which in the course of its re-tellings became the Holy Grail." It is a poem of the hero's development, his spiritual progress.

It is noteworthy that it is in company with his heathen brother "Feirefix of Anjou", that he succeeds in becoming the Grail King. Has this poem any symbolical significance? Does this represent the union of the Wisdom of the East with the rude bravery of the West?[7]

[7] Vide *Studies in Shah-Nama* by Sir J. C. Cogajee. Also see by the same Author: *Iranian and Indian Analogues of the Legend of the Holy Grail*.

Romance would have in any case entered into Europe. There were several factors contributing to it; namely the unquenching thirst of the wandering scholars in search of knowledge and more knowledge, and the booksellers had like *serais* (Inns) at convenient places sprung up to lead on the scholars from knowledge to knowledge. But what gave greatest impetus to Romance was the *Crusade*. The importance of the *Crusade* for Romance cannot be exaggerated. Every Crusader that came to the East went back a poet and a troubadour. The barbarian knight fell under the humanising influence of the East, and was converted into a poet.

In *The Crusades—the Story of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, T. A. Archer and Charles Lethbridge Kingsford write:

"With the First Crusade, however, a new era commences; not only was the knowledge of Eastern lands revived in the West, but a far more intimate acquaintance was established as to the intervening countries and seas.

"The treasures of Arabic skill and Science were imparted to Latin Christendom from another quarter, and in so far as they contributed to the advance of medicine and philosophy, the debt is due to the doctors not of Damascus but of Salerno and Toledo. Nor even was such knowledge of Eastern languages as existed due specially to the Crusades; and the Koran itself was translated about 1144 by an Englishman, Robert, who had gone to study astronomy in Spain, and probably never set foot in Palestine at all. From the same quarter came also the revived knowledge of Aristotle, which paved the way for mediaeval philosophy and scholasticism.

"But if we turn from science to literature we find that the influence exerted by the Grusades was great and manifest. The Crusades were the creation of French-speaking peoples, and, above all of those adventurous Normans, who carried the language of their adoption wheresoever they settled. Never did Christendom come so near having a common speech; for several centuries French was the most universal medium of intercourse from the Atlantic to the Jordon and the Golden Horn.........

"Mediaeval poetry was indeed the creation of French-men and the Crusades. Only one Chanson—that of Roland is certainly of earlier date, but from the moment of the Crusades, the world of Romance wakes into new life. Religious enthusiasm, warlike gallantry and the mystery of the East, all combined to inspire the minstrel

with themes for his song. Jerusalem was hardly captured before French poets began to tell of the achievements of French Knights in French verse. Soon every great Chanson has its Eastern element, Huan of Bordeaux has many adventures in Babylon and the East; Renaud de Mentauban, in his later year, performs no mean exploits in the Holy Land. Bevis of Hamptoun visit Jerusalem and Damascus and weds an emir's daughter; Richard Coeur de Lion's mother, like Thomas a Becket's, is in legend a Saracen princess.....

"The historical narratives thus composed were transformed by later minstrels, who embellished them with romantic additions of their own.....In the process there was created a new romantic literature of pure imagination, where-in the bare facts of the older writers were lost in a wealth of legendary fable, fancy and folly.

"Of all that was entailed for literature in this creation of romance, and of its still abiding influence, we cannot now speak. Perhaps, indeed, it is of more value here to dwell on its importance for the mediaeval world; on the new element of brightness that it brought into man's life; on the inspiration of nobler ideas that it afforded; and on the quickening of the human intellect, of which it was the first and not the least hopeful evidence."

It is hard always for the men of one age to comprehend the enthusiasms of another.

The Romances of Tristan and Iseult, Lancelot and Guenevere, Yusuf and Zulekha, etc., bear ample testimony to the tricks and acts of deception and trenchery performed by lovers to achieve their objects. Romance-loving society in the Middle Ages built up a new creed and a new code of conduct: "True lovers come to good ends, is one convention." Another convention, and the very first article of that convention is that "Love cannot exist between wife and husband, only between wife and lover."

To such lovers Ovid will, at all times and in all ages, prove useful. He had compiled a code for lovers, whose sole aim according to him, was to possess the body of the beloved:

1. Take care first to know the hand-maid of the woman you would win; she will make your approach easy.

2. Nor be tired in your promises ; by promises women are betrayed ; call as witness what gods you please. Don't you see that Jupiter himself was wont to swear falsely by Styx to Juno ; now he favours his own example.

3. Keep far away quarrels and bitter-tongued affrays ; with soft words must love be fostered. With quarrels let wives pursue husbands, and husbands wives, and deem that they are ever at issue with each other ; this befits wives ; the dowry of a wife is quarrelling ; but let your mistress ever hear welcome sounds.

4. Yield if she resists ; by yielding you depart the victor ; only play the part she bids you play.

5. Tears too are useful ; with tears you can melt iron.

6. Take recourse to prayers ; yet if you find that your prayers cause swollen pride, stop what you have begun, draw back a pace. Many women desire what flees them ; they hate what is too forward ; moderate your advance, and save them from getting tired of you.

7. Use a thousand means to waylay as many hearts.

8. Let every lover be pale. This is lover's hue. Let leanness also prove your feelings.

9. Love should never be repressed. If a man represses his love, his fever will only be increased. Marie de France in her lay of *Gingenor* expresses the same feeling when she says : " Love is a wound in the body ; he who does not show his hurt cannot hope for any cure."

The old Greek-cum-Roman-civilization of Europe slowly changed, and during the Middle Ages, when Romance ruled Europe, and when Europe learnt a page from the highly superior civilization of the Arabians, chivalry evolved a new set of code for guidance. The code of Ovid was replaced by the code of Andrew.

Henry Osborn Taylor writes in *Mediaeval Mind* : " Andrew gives a code of love's rules. He would have no

one think that he composed them; but that he saw them written on a parchment attached to the hawk's perch, and won at Arthur's Court by the valour of a certain Breton Knight." They read like proverbs, and undoubtedly represent the ideas of courtly society npon courtly love. There are thirtyone of them. Important ones are given below:

1. Marriage is not a good excuse for rejecting love.

2. Who does not conceal, cannot love.

3. None can love two at the same time. There is no reason why a woman should not be loved by two men or man by two women.

4. It is love's way always to incaease or lessen.

5. None can love except one who is moved by love's suasion.

12. The true lover has no desire to embrace anyone except his (or her) co-lover.

13. Love when published rarely endures.

14. Easy winning makes love despicable; the difficult is held dear.

15. Every lover turns pale in the sight of the co-lover.

16. The lover's heart trembles at the sudden sight of the co-lover.

18. Prowess (probitas) alone makes one worthy of love.

20. The lover is always fearful.

23. The one whom the thought of love disturbs, eats and sleeps little.

25. The true lover finds happiness only in what he deems will please his co-lover.

28. A light fault in the lover awakens the co-lover's suspicion.

30. The true lover constantly, without intermission, is engrossed with the image of the co-lover.

These rules were exemplified in the imaginative literature of courtly love.

Andrew's code is an improvement on the code of Ovid. The code of the Middle Ages shows an advance on the Roman Code. The lover is on the road to progress.

The code of Andrew is the key with which alone can mediaeval feelings and sentiments be unlocked. From Chaucer to the Romantic poets, poetry reflects the mediaeval mind. Scott can hardly be understood without a proper appreciation of the code of honour as reflected in the code of Andrew.

The courtly love of the Mediaeval Age brought into existence worship of the woman with vengeance. Love became the presiding deity.

No doubt there were lovers in plenty, who would say that :

> "My fervent kisses her sweet lips should cover,
> For weeks they would show the traces of her lover."

George Wither (1588-1667) in the *Manly Heart* wrote:

> "Shall I, wasting in despair,
> Die because a woman's fair ?
> Or make pale my cheeks with care,
> Because another's rosy are ?
> Be she fairer than the day,
> Or the flowery meads in May.
> If she thinks not well of me,
> What care I how fair she be ?"

But the ideal to be aimed at was fixed at a very high level. Many would sing with Guirot Riquier :

> "The man who loves not is not noble-minded,
> For love is fruit and blossom of the highest."

Miraval voices the general sentiment of the Age, when he says :

> "Noble is every deed whose root is love."

The sentimental Italian Lipo, Gianni sang :

> "The youthful maiden who appeared to me
> So filled my soul with pure and lofty thoughts,
> That hence-forth all ignoble things I scorn."

To Dante, Beatriee is, "The destroyer of all evil and the queen of all virtues."

There seems to be, however, a difference of opinion as regards the intensity of love possessed by a man and that by a woman for each other.

In the Romance of Aucassin and Nicolette:

Nicolette says: "Ai, I do not believe you love me so much as you say: but I love you better than you love me."

"Nay", said Aucassin, "fair, sweet friend! it may not be that you should love me as I love you. Woman cannot love man as man loves woman. For woman's love is in her eyes and the tip of her breast, and the tip of her toe; but man's loves is planted in her heart within and cannot out".

Lord Byron on the other hand in *Don Juan* says:

"Man's love is of man's life a thing apart,
'Tis woman's whole existence."

Again, what have we in *Much Ado About Nothing*?

"Sigh no more, ladies sigh no more,
Men were deceivers ever,
One foot in sea and one on shore,
To one thing constant never."

But disillusionment made Shakespeare say: "Frailty thy name is woman." The fact really is that both man and woman are egoists.

There is a fifteenth century poem in which the anonymous poet discusses like the old-time troubadours in the form of question and answer the case of a banished knight and her beloved, the Nut-Brown Maid. The knight says:

"Then between us let us discuss
What was all the manere
Between them two: we will also
Tell all the pain in fere
That she was in. Now I begin,
So that ye me answere".



In the course of the discussion, the knight thus says :

"I counsel you, Remember how
It is no maiden's law
Nothing to doubt, but to run out
To wood with an outlaw,
For ye must there-in your hand bear
A bow ready to draw;
And as a thief thus must ye live
Ever in dread and awe;
Whereby to you great harm might grow;
Yet had I liener thou
That I had to the green-wood go;
Alone, a banished man."

The Nut-Brown Maid replies :

"I think not nay, but as you say;
It is no maiden's lore;
But love may make me for your sake,
As ye have said before,
To come on foot, to hunt and shoot,
To get us meat and store;
For so that I your company
May have, I ask no more.
From which to part it maketh my heart
As cold as any stone;
For, in my mind, of all mankind
I love but you alone."

In this poem, we seem to be living in an arcadian age : the simplicity of love, the simplicity of thought, the simplicity of life.

Till recently, when life in an Indian village was simple and peaceful, one could hear a young milkman and a young milkmaid taking part in such contests. But alas the complexity of modern life has pierced a village as well, and the pressure of hard economic life has shattered all the beauty of Romance. One is instinctively reminded of W. H. Davies' poem " Leisure ", and his sigh :

"No time to wait till her mouth can
Enrich that smile her eyes began."

Romance is not satisfied with anything short of feverish love: In support I quote A. P. Herbert's song: "It may be life."

Jack loves me well enough, I know,
But does he ever bite his lip,
And does he chew his cheek to show
That passion's got him in a grip?
An' does his gun go pop-pop-pop
When fellers get familiar? No
He just says, 'Op it!' and they op.
It may be life, but ain't it slow?

As against Herbert, you have Keats, who in *Endymion* thus wrote of the condition of the lover:

"...His poor temples beat
To the very tune of love—how sweet, sweet, sweet."

The word sweet thrice repeated conveys the sense of the beating of the temple.

Sir Thomas Wyatt (1503-1542) in his "Lo, what it is to love", describes the painful consequences of love:

"Love is a fervent fire
Kindled by hot desire;
For a short pleasure
Long displeasure;
Repentance is the hire
A poor treasure
Without measure
Love is a fervent fire.
Lo what it is to love!"

But humanity will have love, even though it may bring about "Long displeasure" and "Repentance". A lover finds pleasure even in this life-long pain, misery and grief.

Robert Burns (1759-1796) felt the agony of love in the following lines:

"Ae fond kiss, and then we sever,
Ae farewell, and then for ever,
Deep in heart-wrung tear. I'll pledge thee!
Warring sighs and groans I'll wage thee!

To what height Ben Jonson (1572-1637) had lifted the position of a beloved, one can find from his poem "Drink to me only."

"Drink to me only with thine eyes,
And I will pledge with mine,
Or leave a kiss within the cup,
And I'll not ask for wine.
The thirst that from the soul doth rise
Doth ask a drink divine,
But might I of Jove's nectar sup
I would not change for thine."

The Mediaeval Age and its youthful Romance spring to life for the second time in the writings of Scott. Verily he is a romancist and will always please the young.

According to Beer:

"Scott is always a little nervous when the lover and the lady are left alone together. The fair dames in the audience expect a tender scene, but the harper pleads his age, by way of apology, gets the business over as decently as possible, and hastens on with comic precipitation to the fighting scene which he thoroughly enjoys:

'Now leave we Margaret and her knight
To tell you of the approaching fight.'"

Scott it must, however, be noted, is the master of Mediaeval etiquette and he has painted love scenes also with due restrictions of modesty and bashfulness. For example one may see Conto II, xxix of the *Lay of the Last Minstrel*:

"And how the knight, with tender fire,
To paint his faithful passion strove;
Swore he might at her feet expire,
But never, never cease to love;
And how she blushed and how she sigh'd,
And, half consenting, half denied,
And said that she would die a maid:
Yet, might the bloody feud be stayed,
Henery of Cranstoun, and only he,
Margaret of Branksome's choice should be."

After this scene, it is not difficult to see why,

"Her blue eyes sought the west afar,
For lovers love the western star."

The advent of dusk is welcome to every Jack and Gill when under the cover of darkness they steal out to meet in the woods nearby.

Scott describes a beautiful form in *Marmian*. When Fitz-Eustace saw Clare, he

"Did by Mary swear,
Some love-lorn fay she might have been,
Or, in Romance, some spell-bound Queen;
For ne'er in work-day world was seen
A farm so witching fair."

Again in *The Lady of the Lake*, he wrote:

"And never did Grecian chisel trace.
A Nymph, a Naiad, or a Grace,
Of finer form, or loverlier face!"

Here is an example of bashfulness:

"One only passion unreveal'd,
With maiden pride the maid conceal'd.
Yet not less purely felt the flame;
O! need I tell that passion's name!"

Is not the lover a knight when he says?

"I'll lightly front each high emprise,
For one kind glance of those bright eyes."

Who has not come under the influence of love?

Scott describes its potent power in the second stanza of the III Canto of *The Lay of the Last Minstrel*:

"In peace Love tunes the Shepherd's reed;
In war, he mounts the warrior's steed;
In halls, in gay attire is seen;
In hamlets, dances on the green.
Love rules the court, the camp, the groove,
And men below, and saints above;
For Love is heaven, and heaven is Love."

Again, who, but Scott, can give a true definition of Love?

"True Love's the gift which God has given;
To man alone beneath the heaven:
It is not fantasy's hot fire,
Whose wishes, soon as granted, fly;
It liveth not in fierce desire,
With dead desire it doth not die;
It is the secret sympathy,
The silver link, the silken tie.
Which heart to heart, and mind to mind,
In body and in soul combin'd."

Scott takes you bodily to the mediaeval Court of Love, composed of ladies alone, where troubadours of high repute sang of deeds of chivalry.

I have put before you Ovid's rule of conduct for lovers. I have also put before you Andrew's Code of honour. Now I shall put before you the same Code as enunciated by Persian poets of old.

The Saracens of Spain were thoroughly acquainted with this Code which guided them in their actions and which subsequently made its way into Europe as Andrew's code to supplant the Code of Ovid and the dry scholasticism of the Roman Catholic Church.

IV

I have classified the Persian Code under four heads:

(A) The Characteristics of Love.

(B) The Characteristics of the Beloved.

(C) The Characteristics of a Lover.

(D) How Love can be conquered.

(A) *The Characteristics of Love*:

The following Ghazal of Urfi (16th Century) illustrates the bondage of Love:

کوی عشقست و همه دانه و دامست اینجا
جلوهٔ مردم آزاد حرام است اینجا
هرکه بگذشت دریں کوی به بند افتادست
طایر بے قفس و دام کدام است اینجا
آنکه هرگام بلغزید دریں کوی برفت
صنعتِ راه روان لغزش گام است اینجا
بروازعشق مچین معرکه اے شیخ حرم
طفل را شیوهٔ بازیچه حرام است اینجا

"This is Love's street herein only deceit and fraud exist.
The glory of a free man is blasphemy.
Whoever passed through this street fell into bondage.
Every bird here is in a cage.
He alone who trembled at each step went into this street
The qualification necessary here is to tremble (with the fear of the beloved).
O! ye follower of Religion (Orthodox),
Do not go near the secret of Love;
This is not the play-ground for children,
Play is forbidden here."

The following couplet of Jami illustrates the "Penal Code" of Love. This couplet has no parallel:

بجرم عشق مرا عشق هزار بار بسوخت
عجب تر آنکه گناهم هنوز پاك نه شد

"For the Crime of Love, Love burnt me a thousand times; the pity of it, however, is that even now my sins have not been purified."

This reminds one of Empedocles and his fall into Mount Etna; and of Goddess Sati jumping into the Havana-Kuṇḍa of her father to purify herself of the triple sins committed by her against her husband, Shiva.

According to Hafiz :

شیر در بادیهٔ عشق تو روباه شود
آه ازین راه که دروي خطری نیست که نیست

"In thy valley of love, even a lion is turned into a fox. May God save one from this road, on which there is no danger that is not met with!"

The following couplet of Urfi illustrates the essence of Love :

هوای باغ محبت بغایتی گرم است
که هیچ سبزه ندید است روی شبنم را

"So exceedingly warm is the air of the garden of love, that no green grass has ever seen even the face of dew."

Faizi says :—

قربان آن تغافل و آن پرسشم که دوش
فریاد من شنیدی و گفتی فغان کیست

" Admirable the forgetfulness and this enquiry! when last night he heard my lamentations and enquired as to whose wailings they were."

(B) *The Characteristics of the Beloved*:

Who but Hafiz can so boldly say :

یارب این بچه ترکان چه دلیراند بخون
که به تیر مژه هر لحظه شکاري گیرند

"O God! How bold these Turkish boys are in killing; that with the arrows of their eyelashes they bring down a prey every moment."

Another couplet of the same poet illustrates the apathetic nature of the beloved :

ماهی و مرغ دوش نخُفت از فغانِ من
وآن شوخ‌دیده بین که سر از خواب بر نکرد

"The fish and the birds (inhabitants of both land and water) did not sleep last night from my lamentations and wailings; but look at that impudent (beloved) who did not even raise his head from the pillow."

Let us see what has Jami found in several romances :

خوانده ام قصهٔ عشاق بسے نیست درون
جز جفاکاریِ دلدار و وفاداریِ دل

"I have read many a tale of lovers and of beloveds. There is nothing in them except the cruelty of the beloved and the faithfulness of the lover."

There is a couplet of Hafiz in the same strain :

میان عاشق و معشوق فرق بسیار است
چو یار ناز نماید شما نیاز کُنید

"There is much difference between a lover and a beloved : When the beloved should show beauty the lover should offer himself as a sacrifice."

(C) *Characteristics of a Lover* :

A true lover must—

1. show extreme obedience,
2. possess excessive love,
3. not use any bitter words against the beloved,
4. bear great pain,
5. seek no remedy except that of love,
6. have no other religion except that of love,
7. completely sacrifice himself,
8. not reveal secrets of love to an enemy,
9. find happiness in love only, and
10. possess steadfastness.

(1) A true lover must show extreme obedience.

Thus says Hafiz:

عاشقان را برسر خود حکم نیست ٭ هرچه فرمان تو باشد آن کنند

"Lovers have no orders to issue;
Whatever be the orders of the beloved, them they execute."

The following two couplets are from Jami:

نه آید از بے ادبان شیوهٔ عشق ٭ مذهب عشق سراسر ادب است

"The dis-obedient cannot follow the path of love;
The religion of love is all obedience."

ملائك را چه سود از حسن طاعت
چو فیضِ عشق بر آدم فروریخت

"Of what use is the obedience of angels to beauty;
When Adam alone was ordained to receive this gift of love."

Truth is Beauty said Keats; Obedience is Love said Jami.

Thus wrote Urfi:

تو محتاجی و من محتاجم اے خلوت نشین لیکن
تو استعداد میخواهی و من ارشاد میخواهم
"You and I are both beggars, O, ye beloved;
You need service, while I need command."

The lover becomes a Knight.

(2) A true lover must possess excessive love.

Thus says Jami:

قاعدهٔ عشق چیست شرط محبت کدام
از همه بگریختن باغمت آمیختن
"Love demands eternal duty of love.
To fly from everything and to embrace sorrow."

Urfi always arrests attention by his originality :

آوارگیست رهبر در وادیِ محبت
طوفان بود معلم دریاے بیکران را

"In the valley of Love, Freedom is the only guide;
Just as storm itself becomes navigator into a fathomless storm-tossed river."

Here the poet sees that Freedom is a necessary factor for love. I wonder if the French Revolution made this couplet their guiding principle! Verily extra-ordinary diseases need extra-ordinary remedies; and is not love one such disease?

According to Hafiz man was created by love. He writes :

خاك را چو در ازل از مي سرشته اند
با مدعي بگو كه چرا ترك وى كنم

"As, in the beginning of creation, God kneaded with wine (Love) the very earth, with which he created me; Tell the plaintiff, how can I abstain from it."

It is in the very nature of man to love.

In another couplet he thus finds support for his rule of conduct :

به پیر میکده گفتم که چیست راهِ نجات
بخواست جامِ مي وگفت باده نوشیدن

"From the old man of the Tavern I enquired the way to salvation. He demanded a cup of wine and said, "Wine-drinking" (Love); i.e., "Go and Love".

(3) A true Lover must not use any bitter words against the beloved.

Thus wrote Hafiz :

صبحدم مرغ چمن با گلِ نو ساخته گفت
نازکم کن که درین باغ بسی چون تو شگفت
گل بخندید که از راست نرنجیم ولي
هیچ عاشق سخنِ تلخ به معشوق نگفت

In the morning the bird of the garden thus spoke to the new bud, "Be a little less proud of thy beauty because in this garden innumerable buds like thee came to flower."

The bud laughed and said, "I do not feel sorry at the truth, but no lover ever addressed a bitter remark to a beloved."

Jami in the following couplet is inimitable :

من نمیگویم توکردی چاکها درجانِ من
هر که بیند جانِ من داند که اینهان کار کیست

"I do not say that thou hast made rents in my heart :
Whoever, however, sees my heart understands as to who has done it."

(4) A true lover must bear great pain.

According to Jami :

گه نکتهٔ عشق می نویسم ❋ گه نغمهٔ درد می سرایم

"I divide my time between writing the secrets of love and singing the song of sorrow."

Thus wrote Urfi :

اُمید عیش کجا و دل خراب کجا
هوای باغ کجا طائر کباب کجا

"Hope of pleasure does not go with an agonised heart;
The cool breeze of the garden does not exist for a bird whom love roasts."

According to Jami :

چیست دانی غنچه هاے ناشگفته در چمن
بلبلان در شاخِ گل دلهاے پر خون بسته اند

"Dost know what these buds in the garden are?
The night-in-gales have suspended their blood-red
hearts on the branches of flower trees."

One more couplet of Urfi :

در دل ما غم دنیا غم معشوق شود
باده گر خام بود پخته کند شیشهٔ ما

"In my heart, the sorrow of the world is changed into the sorrow of the beloved; if the wine be imperfect, my cup makes it perfect."

Who can surpass Iraqi?

بعالم هر کجا درد و غمِ بود
بهم کر دندو عشقش نام کر دند

"Wherever in the world there was pain and sorrow; (the lovers) collected them together and called it Love."

Thus wrote Hafiz :

دوتا شد قامتم همچون کمانے
زغم پیوسته چون ابروے فرخ

"My body was bent double like a bow;
In grief it met like the brows of a beautiful woman."

Yet another couplet of Urfi :

سرمایهٔ عافیت نشناسیم کز ازل
در گرم سیر عشق بسر بردہ ایم ما

"Since the world began, I have never found comfort;
I have been in such hot pursuit of Love."

(5) A true lover must seek no remedy except that of love.

Thus wrote Jami :

مریض عشق تو چون مائلِ شفا گردو
اسیرِ قید توکئے طالبِ نجات شود

"When does the patient of thy love seek cure?
When does thy prisoner seek freedom?"
The reply is 'Never, O! Never."

In another couplet Jami says :

علاج خویش پرسیدم طبیب عشق را روزي
ز فکر عقبیٰ و سودای دیني داد پرهیزم .

"One day I sought remedy from the physician of love;

He advised me to abstain from the thought of the other world, and also from the madness of religion."

Yet another couplet of Jami :

بوالعجب کارے که خلقے در پئے درمان ما
من بفکر آنکه هردم درد خود افزون کنم

"Wonderful business ! The world is seeking remedy for me ; while I am in anxiety to increase my pain from more to more."

(6) A true lover must have no other religion except that of love.

Says Hafiz :

چند گوئی ای مذکر شرحِ دین خاموش باش
دین مادر هر دو عالم صحبت جانان ماست

"How long wilt thou talk of religion ; please be quiet ; in both the worlds, my religion consists in remaining in the company of my beloved."

Yet another couplet of Hafiz !

باغ بہشت ، سایۂ طوبی و قصر حور
با خاك كوے دوست برابر نمی کنم

"The Garden of Heaven and the shade of the Tuba tree and the Castle of the Huris : These stand no comparison before the dust of the street of my beloved."

(7) A true lover must completely sacrifice himself.

The following two couplets are from Jami :

با لذتِ آورگی لذت عشقت
غربت زدگان را نشودمیل و طنها

"The taste for thy love is in proportion to the taste for freedom ; the more the poverty, the less the desire for homeland."

ایزد چو شمع حسن وے افروخت در ازل
بر ما رقم به منصبِ پروانگی کشید

"When, in the beginning, God lighted the flame of his Beauty ;

He conferred upon me the rank of a Moth."

Thus wrote Hafiz :

هر که درپیش بتان از سر جان میلر زد
بی تکلف تن او لایق قربان نشود

"The lovers, who tremble before their beloveds for fear of losing their lives ; without doubt their body cannot be fit for sacrifice."

Thus says Urfi :

بهر سوے روم بوے چراغ کشته مي آید
مگر وقتے مزار کشتگان عشق بود اینجا

"Wherever I roam, I find the smell of the oil of the earthen-lamp dedicated to the blood of the slain ; perchance some day, these places were the graves of those slain by love." It is a custom to burn earthen-lamp and incense on the graves of the departed.

(8) A true Lover must not reveal secrets of love to an enemy (uninitiated.)

Thus says Hafiz :

بامدعی مگوئید اسرار عشق و مستی
تا بیخبر بمیرد در رنج خود پرستی

"Do not tell the secrets of love and intoxication to thy enemy; so that in ignorance he may die in grief of self-love."

It may be noted that love and self-love cannot exist together. Beware of the fate of Narcissus.

Another couplet of Hafiz :

بمستوران مگو اسرار مستی
حدیث جان مپرس از نقش دیوار

"Do not reveal the secrets of love to women (i.e. to rationalists and to false pious people); do not enquire about the doctrines of the soul from the paintings on the wall."

Rationalists are compared to mere paintings on the wall that cannot talk.

(9) A true lover must find happiness in love only.

Thus wrote Hafiz :

حباب وار براند ازم از نشاط کُلاه
اگر ز روی تو عکسے بجام ما اُفتد

"Like a bubble I shall throw up in the air my cup with pleasure, if only the reflection of thy face falls in my cup."

(10) A true lover must possess steadfastness.

Thus says Urfi:

چو یوسفم گذرد در بهشت بر صف حور

نشان دهم بتو هرگام صد زلیخا را

"As Joseph-like I pass in heaven along file on file of *huris* (beautiful damsels of heaven) I shall remain unconcerned even though a hundred Zulekhas may meet me at each step."

(D) *How love can be Conquered?*

When all means of conquering love fails, there is one sure and unfailing means. Both Ovid of Rome and Hafiz of Persia have mentioned it for the benefit of lovers and would-be lovers.

Thus says Hafiz:

دل سنگین ترا اشک من آورد براه

سنگ را سئیل تواند بره دریا بُرد

"My tears brought thy stony heart on the path; swift current alone carries a stone along the river."

Conclusion

Women by nature wish to enter into a life of wedlock and do not like to remain out of wedlock; but the greater the intensity of Romance the more the desire to remain a mistress, a beloved and not to be a wife. Andrew's Code and the Court of Love abundantly exhibit this phase of life. They have their own reasons for this conduct. We, however, find a very peculiar reason advanced by Heloise—that victim of Romance, who has raised its status to a very high pitch. In disapproving of marriage Heloise

says : "How indecent, how lamentable would it be for a man, whom nature had made for *all*, to declare that he belonged to one woman and subject himself to such shame." Again she says : "Remember, Socrates was tied to a wife... Once when enduring a storm of Xanthipphe's clamours from the floor above, he was ducked with slops, and simply said." I know such thunder would bring rain." She further explains herself to Abelard : "There were in you two qualities by which you could draw the soul of any woman, the gift of poetry and the gift of singing, gifts which other philosophers have lacked." The letters of Abelard and Heloise truly mirror this aspect of the mediaeval mind. Starting from the lowest plane, their romance rises higher and higher.

As a nun, in one of her letters, she says : "It is easy in confession to accuse oneself of sins, and also to do penance with the body; but hard indeed to turn the heart from the desire of its greater joys ! They call me chaste who do not know me for a hypocrite. They look upon purity of the flesh as virtue—which is of the soul, not of the body."

Will Jami's following couplet lay bare the working of Heloise's mind ?

سرِ عشق و عبادت‌واعظ ✱ معنی نازك است و لفظ رکیك

"The secret of love and prayer, O ! saint :
The words are too subtle and their meaning equally deep.
Who can fathom their mystery ?"

The poet must have been lifted beyond himself to write this couplet. It is an echo from the other world. In a *less* exalted mood, he perhaps attempted a commentary of the above couplet, in the following two couplets.

قامتش را سجده بُردم چون بهانه یافتم
وے چومست ناز از پیش نماز من گذشت

"To my beloved's person I offered prayer by touching the ground with the forehead, whenever I found a pretext, when that intoxicated beauty passed before me as I sat in prayer."

Yet another one in the like strain :

خوش آنکه تو نشینی ومن پیش روی تو
سازم بهانه بهر سجودے نماز را

"It is blessedness when thou shouldst sit and before thee I should make a pretext for offering prayer (to God) but really to thee."

Strange is the way and Code of Love ! But what is the origin of this love ? Is this divine ?

Please mark, according to divinely-gifted Hafiz :

در ازل پر توِ حسنت ز تجلی دم زد
عشق پیدا شد و آتش بهمه عالم زد

"In the beginning of Creation, the light of God's Beauty longed for manifestation; Love was born and its fire burnt the whole world. No wonder then that the fire of Love burns out its devotees."

Romance is as old as the world. The story of Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden is eternal. Thomas Hardy expresses the universal truth when he says :

"Yonder a maid and her wight
Come whispering by;
War's annals will cloud into night
Ere their story die."

Says Walter de la Mare :

"Very old are we men;
Our dreams are tales
Told in dim Eden
By Eve's night-in-gales.

We wake and whisper awhile,
But the day gone by,
Silence and Sleep like fields
Of amaranth lie."

According to Urfi :

عشق از آدم و حوا متولد شده است
تازه برخاسته این شعلهٔ انیش من است

"Love is descended from Adam and Eve;
Anew has this flame been born in me."

I shall close this story of the unity of Love and Beauty, with a fervent hope embodied in a lyric with a spirited lilt of the Madeaeval Age, called *Pervigilium Veneris, the Vigil of Venus*—probably of the fourth century A. D.—which Walter Pater has interwoven with his own romance of Marius the Epicurean :

"Loveless hearts shall love tomorrow,
Hearts that have loved shall love again.
Spring is young, and spring is singing,
Spring is life, where death had lain.
Spring is time of true love's knitting,
In the spring the birds are wed,
Under the rain of her lord's blessing
The forest waves her leafy head.
Loveless hearts shall love tomorrow,
Hearts that have loved shall love again.

Now, gentlemen :

"To all, to each, a fair good-night
And pleasing dreams, and slumbers light."

THE PRĀTIMOKṢA SŪTRA OF THE MAHĀSĀṄGHIKAS*

By W. Pachow

AND

Ramakanta Mishra

Introduction

Vinaya literature has offered students of Indian history and culture a vast field of research. It had a very close connection with the social customs and manners of Buddhist India when the *Prātimokṣa-Sūtra* was first shaped into being. In this particular work we are offered the opportunity to have a glimpse into the originality and resourcefulness of the early Buddhists in formulating the regulations for the members of the Saṅgha. Of course, its main purpose concerns the disciplinary prohibitions which generally govern the daily conduct and decorum of the Bhikṣus. However, the more important hidden factor that prompted the formation of these rules was the social environment under which the Buddhist Saṅgha existed. If one takes a casual perusal of the text one will not fail to find rules speaking in terms of 'not to take meals at the wrong time (i.e., after mid-day), not to travel with a woman by appointment, not to be associated with thieves and the army......' and so forth. Why so? one may

*Critically edited for the first time from palm-leaf Manuscripts found in Tibet.

very well ask. The reason was simple enough, *viz.*, the law-making authorities of the Saṅgha were very sensitive to public reaction. If there was any complaint against even the slightest misbehaviour of its members, they would try to promulgate a new rule or introduce amendments to the existing ones, as often as possible, in order to get the wrong corrected. It may be natural that as the Buddhist Saṅgha came into existence for the first time in Indian religious history, it had, in many aspects, to fall in line with the social etiquette prevalent at that time. Moreover, economically the Saṅgha was not independent. It had to bank upon the good will and support of the laity for its maintenance. The word 'bhikṣu' literally means a person who begs for food. This illustrates the financial aspect of the Saṅgha. The laity offered food and other requisites to these mendicants, not because they had to, but probably because they revered the Buddha as a great sage, or they had good faith in the Buddhist doctrine of karman, or else they respected the members of the Saṅgha for their purity in mind and deeds. To inspire confidence and deepen the faith of the laity, the Bhikṣus on their part had to be more religious and pure in their daily conduct. That is why Śīla or observance of the disciplinary rules played a very important part on the practical side of Buddhist life. It is considered even now, the first requisite for the perfection of profound meditation (Dhyāna) and wisdom (Jñāna). What would happen, if the Bhikṣus would misbehave by indulging in the various categories of sensual pleasure as the laymen do? Well, they would quite likely lose the confidence and sympathy of their lay disciples, that is to say, they would no longer be supplied with food, clothes, medicine and other daily necessities by the laity, and ultimately the structure of the Saṅgha would collapse and come to ruination. That would be very disas-

trous and the Buddha would never allow it to happen. Hence, various regulations embodied in the *Prātimokṣa-Sūtra* were promulgated and there lies its importance as a protector or guardian of the Buddhist religion. Scholars of old who used to emphasise its weight only on the religious side were usually overlooking the social and economic aspects as we have pointed out just now. We consider the latter the more important factor which contributed to the formation of the Prātimokṣa rules.

This work consists of eight principal sections, the names of which are given below :—

		Number of rules
1.	Pārājika	4
2.	Saṁghātiśeṣa[1]	13
3.	Aniyata Dharmas	2
4.	Niḥsargika Pācattika	30
5.	Pācattika	92
6.	Prātidesanīya Dharmas	4
7.	Śaikṣa Dharmas	67
8.	Adhikaraṇa-Śamatha Dharmas	7
	Total[2] ..	219

Each of these sections has a number of regulations governing the various aspects of daily conduct of the Bhikṣus. The nature of these rules may be classified under the following heads :—

[1]The Pali text has 'Saṁghāvaśeṣa'. The correct form would be 'Saṁghādiśeṣa', but the present text has 'Saṁghātiśeṣa'.

[2]This is the total found in the present Sanskrit text. The number varies greatly in the Prātimokṣa texts of other Buddhist schools.

Number of rules

1.	Rules relating to the opposite sex ..	18
2.	Rules relating to food, drink and medicine	23
3.	Rules relating to robes and various personal belongings	40
4.	Rules relating to housing, association, living and bathing etc. ..	10
5.	Rules relating to wrong views, schism and misbehaviour	23
6.	Rules relating to Saṅgha-karma and the recitation of the *Prātimokṣa-Sūtra* ..	17
7.	Rules relating to killing, stealing and associating with the army or thieves	11
8.	Rules relating to trade, accepting money etc.	8
9.	The Śaiksa Dharmas or rules of decorum	113
	Total[3] ..	263

If any member of the Saṅgha violated any of the rules classified above, punishment or atonement would be imposed upon him according to the nature of the offence. In fact, each rule is grouped under a particular section for purposes of punishment except section III Aniyata Dharmas, section VII Śaikṣa Dharmas and section VIII Adhikaraṇa-śamatha Dharmas. As the Buddhists do not inflict upon anybody any corporal punishment, nor impose any fine, their punishments are comparatively light. Punish-

[3] This figure is based on the text of the 'Sarvāstivādin Prātimokṣa' *Nanjio* No. 1160.

ment is shown below in accordance with the different sections in the *Prātimokṣa-Sūtra* :—

1. Class I. Excommunication for the violation of any of the Pārājika rules.
2. Class II. Mānatta and Parivāsa or atonement by following a prescribed process for the violation of any of the Saṁghātiśeṣa rules.
3. Class III. Forfeiture and formal confession for the violation of any of the Nihsargika-pācattika rules.
4. Class IV. Formal confession for the violation of any of the pācattika rules.
5. Class V. Formal confession for the violation of any of the Prātidesanīya rules.

From the foregoing passages and tables we may safely conclude that the function of the *Prātimokṣa-Sūtra* is to govern the conduct of the Bhikṣus, to maintain peace and unity in the Order and by putting it into force, the Saṅgha is empowered to impose punishment and penalties on the culprits.

The growth of the *Prātimokṣa-Sūtra* is another aspect which appears to be interesting. Some of the rules such as the Four Pārājikas and others were definitely formulated during the life-time of the Buddha, while others like the Śaikṣa Dharmas were constantly growing and expanding in the various Buddhist schools even long after the passing away of the Founder of that religion. To substantiate this statement we may refer to the table concerning the number of rules in the different Prātimokṣa texts in "*A comparative study of the Prātimokṣa*" by Dr. W. Pachow[4].

---

[4]See '*The Sino-Indian Studies*' vol. IV part 1 and 2, 1951. Viśva-Bharati University, Santiniketan, India.

In that table we find 263 rules in the Sarvāstivādin text and 218 in the Mahāsāṅghika, thus there is an increase of 45 rules in the former. Again, in the section of Śaikṣa Dharmas we find 113 rules in the former and 66 in the latter[5]—that is, an increase of 41 rules. How are we to account for this big gap of numerical differences ? Our assumption is that the section of Śaikṣa Dharmas was called 'The section of many Śaikṣa Dharmas'. The word 'many' is indefinite, and hence, a good number of schools added, according to their convenience, as many rules as they desired. Consequently we can hardly find any agreement in number between the various existing Prātimokṣa texts of different schools. Moreover, this section of the Śaikṣa Dharmas chiefly concerns the decorum of the Bhikṣus such as how to put on garment, how to sit and eat and so forth. If anybody failed to observe any of the rules prescribed therein, the Saṅgha will not be in a position to impose on him any punishment as there is no provision for that.

Regarding the date of composition of this work we may suggest that firstly, it was not composed by a single individual but shared by many unknown hands[6]. Secondly, its earliest part should reach far back to the neighbourhood of 500 B. C. and the final shape of the Pāli and the Mahāsāṅghika texts may at the most take 100 years to undergo their fullest development, including the Śaikṣa Dharmas. Its growth may thus have been completed in about 400 B. C. This looks probable, if we make a comparative survey of the development of all the versions of the schools. In any

[5]The present Sanskrit text of the Mahāsāṅghika School has 67 Śaikṣa-Dharma rules.

[6]The Sarvāstivādin Vinaya in Chinese gives us a testimony to this effect that even during the life-time of the Buddha, the Bhikṣus proclaimed a Pācattika rule prohibiting the members to see the Blessed One except at the time of sending him food and performing the Uposatha. This was probably a temporary measure.

case, the latest date of its recension cannot possibly be placed after 272 B. C., or just before Aśoka's coronation in 269 B. C. The reason is very obvious; in the Bhābrū Edict[7], Aśoka recommends seven texts of the Buddhist Cannon to the Saṅgha. Amongst these, the first one is 'Vinaya-samukkase'[8] which might have had some connection with the *Prātimokṣa-Sūtra* as Oldenberg and Rhys Davids have suggested.

These texts mentioned by Aśoka must have been very popular and much in vogue before his ascent to the throne. For achieving such a high degree of prominence, it is necessary to take a considerable length of time. Making allowance for all possibilities, we would like to state that the oldest rules of the *Prātimokṣa-Sūtra* date back to 500 B. C. and the latest could not possibly be later than 250 B. C.

So far we have discussed the historical and functional aspects of the Prātimokṣa. We may now shift our attention to the present Sanskrit text which is the *Prātimokṣa-Sūtra* of the 'Lokottaravādins' of the Mahāsāṅghika school. The original manuscript written on palm-leaves was preserved in Tibet and was brought to India in photo negatives by Mahāpandit Rahula Sāṅkṛtyāyana who, some ten years ago, had gone there, braving all danger and hardships in search of old Sanskrit manuscripts. Through the good offices of Prof. Tan Yun Shan, Visva-Bharati University, Santiniketan, and by courtesy of the *Bihar Research Society*, Patna, we were able to secure the negatives for our editing purpose. We appreciate their assistance and express our deep gratitude. As this is merely a photographic copy of the manuscript, inspite of our best efforts,

[7] V. Smith: *Aśoka*, p. 154.

[8] *SBE.* vol. xiii, p. xxvi.

a few places of very faint lines could not be deciphered. However, we have much pleasure in stating that so far as the text proper is concerned we are in possession of a complete version which is indeed a great wealth to Vinaya literature. Uptil now, barring the Pāli text of the *Prātimokṣa-Sūtra*, no other complete manuscript of this work was found, although fragmentary[9] bits have been worked upon by Western scholars like M. Finot and others. With the discovery of this text, two important points of Buddhist history may be reconsidered. Firstly, the claim of the Theravādins that they are the only custodians of early Buddhist Vinaya traditions may be challenged, because after a careful survey of the Pāli Pātimokkha and the present Sanskrit version, one finds that there is hardly any difference between them in antiquity and contents. On the contrary, the number of rules in the Sanskrit text is less than that of the Pāli version, to wit there are 218 rules in the former (the Mahāsāṅghika text) and 227 rules in the latter (the Pāli text). Again, this difference arose only in the section of Śaikṣa Dharmas, the Pāli has 75 rules and the Mahāsāṅghika[10] only 66 cr 67. If we believe the usual process of historical development, it appears that the Mahāsāṅghika text seems even older in existence than that of the present Pāli version. May be there is an older version of the Pāli text, but we know nothing about it.

Secondly, there is a Southern tradition which states that the Vajjian Bhikṣus being defeated in the *Second Buddhist*

---

[9]A. F. Rudolf Hoernle: *Manuscript remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan*, 1916.

M. Finot: *Le Prātimokṣasūtra des Sarvāstivādins*, JA. 1913. Erust Waldschmidt: *Bruchstucke des Bhikṣuni-Prātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins.* 1926.

[10]The Mahāsāṅghika Prātimokṣa in Chinese has 66 rules and the present Sanskrit version has 67 rules.

Council at Vaiśāli, in connection with the Ten Points, held a separate Council. This Council which was known as *Mahāsaṅgīti* (the great Council of the Mahāsāṅghikas) had a recension of the Buddhist Cannon. By careful investigation we find the statements from Sinhalese[11] sources concerning the said Council to be doubtful and shaky. In the first place, we do not find in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya the other nine points connected with this *Second Council* except the prohibition of accepting gold and silver which was the original item objected to by Yaśas. If we accept this particular item as the true object of dispute, the other nine points mentioned by the Therāvādins described in the Pāli Vinaya and in the Vinayas of their sub-sects such as the Sarvāstivādins and others should be regarded simply as a 'home affair'. In the second place, if there was really a different redaction of the cannonical literature carried out by the Mahāsāṅghikas in a different Council at that time, may we ask then, how is it that the point in question (accepting gold and silver) is still retained not only in the *Prātimokṣa-Sūtra* of that school but also in its commentary?.

These are the facts concerning the Mahāsāṅghikas. The future historians of Indian Buddhist history may write out a different version from what has been interpreted to us by the Southern traditions.

The present text was written on palm-leaves consisting of 44 folios. We have marked the front page of each folio 'A' and its back side 'B'. The script used here is similar to that of the Pala Dynasty[13] of Bengal in the 11th

---

[11]See *Dipavaṁsaṁ*, IV, 52 ; *Mahāvaṁsaṁ*, p. 1 lvi ; Kern's *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, p. 105.

[12]*Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya* (in Chinese) ch. 33.

[13]Cf. G. H. Ojha : *The paleography of India*, plate 32.

century A. D. The particular and puzzling features of this script are :—

Pa	—	Yạ,			and etc. looked exactly alike.
Ta	—	Bha	—	O,	
Śa	—	Ṇa,			
Va	—	Ba,			
Ca	—	Dha,			
Sa	—	Ma,			

Sometimes there is a little distinction indicated by a heavy stroke between these pairs. Otherwise we have no resource to bank upon except following the guidance of the Chinese translation in order to arrive at the correct Sanskrit meaning. Take for instance, the word 'Yācaka' or 'Pācaka' in Sanskrit. The script does not give any difference so far as the first syllable 'Yā' or 'Pā' is concerned. We have to decide at our discretion which of the two is likely to be more fitting in a particular case. It presents a more difficult task when any two or more of the pairs mentioned above are used in combination in a particular word. Take, for example, the word 'Kūṇapa' which may be written as 'Kūṇaya', 'Kūśaya', 'Kūlaya' or 'Kūśapa' and so forth, but none of these forms could give the correct meaning except 'Kūṇapa', because we have decided to retain it by the context which runs :—

"Kūṇapamiva samudrato samutkṣipta :"

"As the corpse is thrown out of the ocean."

Besides what has been shown here, there were innumerable baffling cases in the process of deciphering the manuscript which naturally includes making corrections of the mistakes committed by the copyists.

On folio 44B there is a discription :—

"Śākyabhikṣu śrivijayabhadra likhitamidaṁ"

claiming that the Ms. was copied by Bhikṣu Vijaya Bhadra. This may be a partial truth, because on a careful scrutiny we found that up to folio 23B the bold handwriting is definitely different from the remaining folios. And from time to time there were corrections or additions on the margin of the folios attempted by different hands. It seems quite certain that the text was copied by more than one Indian Bhikṣu in the 11th century A.D. When it was brought to Tibet (the actual date we are unable to decide) and kept in the safe custody in a monastary, a few Tibetans tried to scribble a few remarks on folio 44B—the last page of the Ms. Possibly it had been undisturbed until Mahāpandit Rahula Sāṅkṛtyāyana arranged to have it photographed some ten years ago.

On folio 44A we have the following description :—

"Samāptaṁ prātimokṣa-sūtraṁ ārya mahāsāṅghikānāṁ lokottaravādināṁ madhyoddesikānāṁ....."

"Here ends the *Prātimokṣa-Sūtra* of the Lokottaravādins of the Ārya Mahāsāṅghikas who lived in Central India."

Taking this statement into consideration and comparing the text with the Chinese translation of the *Mahāsāṅghika Prātimokṣa Sūtra,* we may say that we possess a solid proof that the present Sanskrit version is one of the earliest extant copies of *Prātimokṣa-Sūtra* of the Mahāsāṅghika school. This text agrees with the Chinese counterpart in number (except one rule), in substance and in arrangement, with regard to the serial order. As we have already stated elsewhere that with the discovery of this work the Pāli version of Prātimokṣa may have to yield its so far undisputed glory of antiquity to this new comer. We are of the opinion that soon it will be enshrined in its rightful place by the orientalists.

The language used in this work cannot be called good Sanskrit, nor did the authors observe the strict Sanskrit grammar or phonetics. Some of the examplary forms that may be illustrated here are :—

1. Dharmo, dharmmo and dhammo—Folio 4B.
2. Nissarjjaka—Folio 16B. Nissargika—Folio 17A.
   Ni:saggika—F. 17B. and F. 22A.
   Nisaggika—F. 17B. Niśagika—F. 21B.
3. Śārddhaṁ and Sārdhaṁ—F. 6B.
   Sārdhaṁ and Sārddham (with a dot on Dha)—F. 28A.
4. Puna bhikṣū : sānghike and
   Puna bhikṣū sānghike—F. 26A.
5. Pūrvve—F. 27A.
6. Sārvva—F. 3A.
7. Instead of using the correct Sanskrit form 'mune' (6th Possessive case), the text has 'munisya'.—F. 43A.
8. "A" and "Ya" are interchangeable i.e., Pratinissareya and Pratinissarea. F 12B.

and similar many other irregularities. The above-mentioned forms are used freely in different places. Could some of them such as 'Sārvva' give us the suggestion that the language used was in an intermediate stage between the Sanskrit 'Sārva' and Prakrit or Pāli 'Sābba' ? Because it appears to be neither purely Sanskrit nor purely Prakrit or Pāli. Of course, one thing is certain, that is to say, it belongs to Buddhist Sanskrit and as such, it can be excused for having taken liberty from the refined Sanskrit[14].

The other aspect of the text, we have to mention here, is that it has a very lengthy introduction (about 5

[14] It may belong to Hybrid Sanskrit as termed by Prof. F. Edgerton of the Yale University.

folios), mostly in verses. Its chief purport was to sing the praise of those who observe strictly the disciplinary rules proclaimed by the Blessed One. However, this is not in concordance with the Chinese translation, though the latter, too, had introductory stanzas and peculiarities of its own. The size of the introduction of the present work is about two to three times larger than the Chinese version and it has no similarity whatsoever with Prātimokṣa texts of other schools, so far as we are aware of. It looks natural to presume that it is a later addition or interpolation by some unknown author. This assumption is supported by the evidence we found in the text proper. In Pācattika 83, the Chinese version mentions only three materials *viz.*, bone, ivory and horn from which a needle-case may be prepared whereas in the Sanskrit text in addition to these three, the following three precious articles: gold, silver and gems are also included. Unfortunately, the interpolater forgot the fact that to touch gold or silver in any form is a Nissargika Pācattika (No. 18) offence. Anyway this would suggest that in some places unknown persons had tried to add something to the text, although we do not find such practice in an older[15] text like the Chinese counterpart. Comparing with the Chinese translation, the other notable additions in the text are :—

Section	V.	rule 29	adds:	'Sīvayeya'.
„	V.	„ 38	„	'Saṁvibhajitvā vā'.
„	V.	„ 61	„	'Tiryagyonigataṁ'.
„	V.	„ 75	„	'Sūtradharānvinayadharān mātṛkādharān'.
„	V.	„ 82	„	'Kṣatriyasya mūrdhābhiṣiktasya janapadasthāmavīryaprāptasya'.

[15]*Nanjio* No. 1159, translated by Buddhabhadra, about A. D. 416.

Section V. rule 83 adds: 'Suvaṇṇamayaṁvā rūpyamayaṁvā ratanamayamvā.

„ VII. „ 27 „ 'Nāvakiṇṇakārakaṁ piṇḍapātraṁ paribhūṁjiṣyaṁīti..' This is an additional rule which is not found in the Chinese version.

Another feature which may be noted here, is, the Uddāna or the Resumè which generally appears at the end of ten rules. If a particular section has less, then the resumè confines itself to the given number. However, this practice is not found in the Chinese translation. Further, at the end of the text, the verses supposed to be the utterances of the Past Seven Buddhas are also not entirely in agreement with the Chinese counterpart so far as the serial order and authorship of the verses are concerned. For these differences, details have been given in the footnotes.

In our original plan we had the idea of having an English translation of this work. Later on, we did not find it advisable, because there are already several English and French translations of the *Prātimokṣa-Sūtra* easily accessible to scholars who are interested in oriental studies. Below are the references of these translations :—

1. English translations :
   1. The Patimokkha, translated from the Pāli by T. W. Rhys Davids and Herman Oldenberg. SBE. vol. xiii.
   2. So-sor-thar-pa, being the Tibetan version of Prātimokṣa of the Mūla-sarvāstivāda school, translated from Tibetan by Satis Chandra Vidyabhusan JASB. 1915 No. 3 and 4.

3. A comparative study of the Prātimokṣa, on the basis of its Chinese, Tibetan, Sanskrit and Pāli versions. (A complete translation of the Sarvāstivādin *Prātimokṣa Sūtra* from the Chinese is included). By W. Pachow. The Sino-Indian Studies, Vol. IV. part 1 and 2, 1951. Visva-Bharati University, Santiniketan, India.

II. French translation:

1. Le Prātimokṣasūtra des Sarvāstivādins, texte Sanskrit, par M. Louis Finot avec la version Chinoise de Kumarajiva, traduite en Francis par M. Edouard Huber, JA. 1913.

These translations in a way, have lightened our burden. But we think it essential to have a concordance table between the Sanskrit Mahāsāṅghika version and the texts of the Chinese counterpart, of the Sanskrit Sarvāstivādin, and of the Pāli. From these tables, the reader will be in a position to judge how far the texts are in agreement. And if he has any of the aforesaid translations before him, he will have, absolutely, no difficulty in knowing the meaning of the present Sanskrit version.

Here are the concordance tables:

I. The 4 Pārājikas:

Msg. Skt.[16]	Msg. Ch.[17]	Sv. Skt.[18]	Pali.[19]
1–4	1–4	1–4	1–4.. All identical

[16]The Sanskrit text of the Mahāsāṅghikas.

[17]The Chinese translation of the Mahāsāṅghikas.

[18]The Sanskrit text of the Sarvāstivādins.

[19]The Pali text of the Pātimokkha.

II. The 13 Saṁghātiśeṣas :

Msg. Skt.	Msg. Ch.	Sv. Skt.	Pali.	
1–11	1–11	1–11	1–11 ...	All identical
12	12	13	12	
13	13	12	13	

III. The 2 Aniyata Dharmas :

Msg. Skt.	Msg. Ch.	Sv. Skt.	Pali.	
1–2	1–2	1–2	1–2 ...	All identical

IV. The 30 Niḥsargika Pācatikas :

Msg. Skt.	Msg. Ch.	Sv. Skt.	Pali.	
1–10	1–10	1–10	1–10 ...	All identical
11	11	12	12	
12	12	13	13	
13	13	11	11	
14	14	14	14	
15–18	15–18	15–18	15–18 ...	All identical
19	19	20	20	
20	20	19	19	
21–22	21–22	21–22	21–22	
23	23	30	23	
24	24	25	25	
25	25	26	24	
26	26	23	26	
27	27	24	27	
28	28	27	28	
29	29	28	29	
30	30	29	30	

V. The 92 Pācattikas :

Msg. Skt. and Msg. Ch.	Sv. Skt.	Pali.	
1–3	1–3	1–3	... All identical
4	4	63	
5	5	7	
6	6	4	
7	7	8	
8	8	9	
9	9	81	
10	10	72	
11	11	11	
12	13	12	
13	12	13	
14	14	14	
15	15	15	
16	16	17	
17	17	16	
18	18	18	
19	19	19	
20	20	19	
21	21	21	
22	22	22	
23	..	23	
24	23	24	
25	28	30	
26	24	27	
27	25	28	
28	26	25	
29	27	26	
30	30	29	
31	32	31	
32	31	33	
33	34	35	

Msg. Skt. and Msg. Ch.	Sv. Skt.	Pali.
34	35	36
35	39	40
36	37	37
37	38	38
38	33	34
39	40	39
40	36	32
41	52	56
42	53	5
43	54	79
44	51	42
45	55	68
46	56	69
47	57	70
48	59	58
49	58	84
50	60	57
51	41	62
52	44	41
53	..	..
54	42	43
55	45	48
56	46	49
57	47	50
58	48	74
59	49	75
60	50	64
61	61	61
62	62	77
63	68	59
64	67	60
65	66	55
66	64	53

Msg. Skt. and Msg. Ch.	Sv. Skt.	Pali.
67	63	52
68	70	67
69	65	6
70	43	44
71	72	65
72	71	66
73	73	10
74	74	47
75	75	71
76	79	51
77	78	54
78	76	78
79	77	80
80	80	85
81	81	46
82	82	83
83	84	86
84	85	87
85	86	88
86	89	89
87	88	90
88	87	91
89	90	92
90	69	76
91	..	..
92	83[20]	73[21]

[20] 89 rules out of 90 of the Sv. Skt. text are in agreement with the Msg. versions.

[21] 90 rules out of 92 of the Pali version are in agreement with the Msg. texts.

VI. The 4 Pratidesaniyas :

Msg. Skt. and Msg.Ch.	Sv. Skt.	Pali.
1	4	4
2	1	1
3	2	2
4	3	3

VII. The Saikṣa Dharmas :

Msg. Skt. and Msg. Ch.	Sv. Skt.	Pali.
1	12	1
2	(missing)	2
3	17	3
4	21	7
5	27	13
6	..	11
7	31	23
8	37	9
9	..	25
10	35	21
11	53	15
12	51	19
13	47	17
14	18	4
15	22	8
16	28	14
17	..	12
18	32	24
19	38	10
20	..	..
21	60	..
22	36	22
23	..	..
24	62	27

Msg. Skt. and Msg. Ch.		Sv. Skt.	Pali.
25		65	34
26		(missing)	..
27	..	..	..
28	27	..	46
29	28	76	49
30	29	68	39
31	30	70	41
32	31	69	40
33	32	66	45
34	33	71	43
35	34	..	..
36	35	78	52
37	36	..	..
38	37	73	51
39	38	..	..
40	39	(missing)	..
41	41	81	47
42	40	80	48
43	42	85	38
44	43	86	32
45	44	(missing)	37
46	45	83	36
47	47	88	56
48	46	82	55
49	48	93	70
50	49	94	64
51	50	92	69
52	51	104	62
53	52	103	61
54	53	95	67
55	54	96	66
56	55	..	..
57	56	..	..

Msg. Skt. and	Msg. Ch.	Sv. Skt.	Pali.
58	57	107	59
59	58	109	60
60	59	105	58
61	60	106	57
62	61	91	71
63	62	89	63
64	63	90	72
65	64	110	74
66	65	111	75
67	66	112	73

VIII. The 7 Adhikaraṇa Śamatha Dharmas :

Msg. Skt. and Msg. Ch.	Sv. Skt.	Pali.	
1–4	1–4	1–4	....All identical
5	5	6	
6	6	5	
7	7	7	

One more word, we would like to add, is that in all other texts of *Prātimokṣa-Sūtra*, including the translations in Chinese and Tibetan, there are only 8 sections, whereas the present Sanskrit Text and its Chinese counterpart have created the illusory appearance of possessing a 9th section, i.e., the section of two Dharmas—Dharma and Anudharma. In explaining[22] the two Dharmas it says that 'Dharma' means the two Vinayas, and 'Anudharma' means all the rules that have been established here. However, if we examine the matter carefully, we find there is nothing in common with the foregoing sections inasmuch as it has no substance in itself. We, therefore, cannot recognize this as an independent section.

[22] See folios 14B and 42A of the present Sanskrit text.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR 1950-51

On behalf of the Executive Committee of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute I present the Annual report for the year ending March 31, 1951. During the year under review there has been no work of any great importance. The usual routine work has been followed throughout the year. In order to accommodate more books in as little a space as possible, the library has been equipped with 14-feet high iron-shelves costing Rs. 1,543 13 as. Nevertheless, with the further expansion of our activities, we realised the need of a further extension of our building; and accordingly, it was decided to extend it in the front at the estimated cost of about Rs. 22,000. This would also add to the good appearance of the building.

Efforts have been made to secure donations for the Institute. But it is a matter of great regret that the response has not been at all encouraging. During the year the Uttara Pradesha Government could give us a recurring grant of Rs. 1,000/- along with a non-recurring grant of Rs. 1,000/- only. The Government of West Bengal has given us a handsome donation of Rs. 2,500/- for which we are very grateful to our member, Hon'ble Dr. K. N. Katju, the then Governor of West Bengal, and to the Minister of Education. We also approached the Union Government in the Ministry of Education, but so far we have not received any grant from them.

It is unnecessary for me to point out that the situation in the country has entirely changed and the attention of the people has been diverted towards the development of materialistic, scientific and technical advancement of the country, and that there seems to be very little enthusiasm

towards the progress of humanistic sciences. Thus it has become very difficult to secure donations for the advancement of higher studies in Indology. All this has put us in a great anxiety as to how we can expand our activities. This has, at the same time, augumented the responsibilities of the scholars who alone realise the need of higher studies in Indology. I, therefore, make an appeal to them to rise to the situation and make their best efforts to preserve the heritage of India's past glories by persuading generous donors to encourage higher studies in humanistic sciences by awarding scholarships, and by helping the equipment of our library with up-to-date publications and manuscripts.

Membership

The total number of Ordinary Members of the Institute on the 31st of March 1951 was 80. We lost some members but their place was filled up by new ones. Of the 85 Life-Members, two died but we could enlist three new members; so the total was 86. Of the 20 Benefactors one passed away and we could add one new member; so their number has remained as before. Thus the total number of all the members of the Institute was 209.

Meetings

As regards the meetings of the Executive Committee, I regret to say that though only three meetings were called during the year, yet for want of quorum only one could be held and the rest of the business had to be carried out by correspondence only.

Publications

During the year we published three issues of our Research Journal containing 398 pages. I am sorry to point out that in spite of our best efforts we were not able to bring the publication of the Journal up-to-date for reasons over

which we had no control. I am glad to inform the members that the book *Sanskrit Document* is now ready and soon it will be in the hands of our members.

Library

During the course of this year we received 54 books for review and they have been all placed in the library. Two foreign and three inland Journals have been added to our exchange list. Thus the total number of the Journals received in exchange was 51. Besides, we are deeply grateful to the Parsi Panchayat Trust of Bombay for presenting to our library 165 books on Iranian learning.

Needs and Suggestions

Our needs are manifold and they have been already placed before the members on various occasions : namely, award of research scholarships, equipment of library with up-to-date publications of original texts, critical oriental publications and oriental Journals from all over the world, eollection of manuscripts, and completion of the building. Then, there is a great need for having a whole-time curator for the Institute who will not only look after the libray but also do research work. We want also to publish important and rare Sanskrit texts.

I beg to repeat what I have said several times before, that the Inststitute should take up the work of writing an authentic history of Indian literature, especially Sanskrit literature, in all its aspects. The last but the most important work which the Institute should do is to prepare a chronology of Sanskrit works and authors. It is high time that Indian scholars should take up this work. For all these, we require a band of sincere and qualified scholars who have also studied Sanskrit on traditional lines. But this can be done only when we have sufficient funds at our disposal. I therefore draw the attention cf generous donors and

scholars to come to our help. And if our Institute is able to achieve any success in this direction we shall have our aims achieved a good deal.

With these few words I express my most sincere thanks to all those who have helped the Institute in various capacities. I am fully confident that they will continue their kind co-operation in future also.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Psychological Studies in Rasa. By Dr. Rakesa Gupta. Published by Mrs. T. Gupta, C/o L. N. Agrawal, Mansingh Gate, Aligarh. Pp. 6+179. Price Rs. 5/- 1950.

"Rasa" is practically a sealed book to modern scholars. Sanskritists who attempted to analyse the doctrine did not approach it from the psychological stand-point but purely from the alaṅkāric angle, and psychologists who are competent to deal with the most baffling problems in aesthetics by-passed the doctrine, because they lacked the necessary training in Sanskritic Studies. This state of affairs is unfortunate. We should, therefore, feel grateful to Dr. Rakesa Gupta for presenting to us his *Psychological Studies in Rasa.* Dr. Gupta attempts to express and expound the ancient Indian Rasa concepts in terms of modern psychology, and it is here that danger lurks in its most subtle form. For some time I have been giving attention to this problem, and it is my firm conviction that Indian Psychological concepts cannot be fully and correctly rendered in the language of Western Psychology. The difference between the two is analogous to the difference between Indian (Carnatic) music and Western (Orchestral) music. Each moves and functions in a separate plane and each is *sui generis.*

It may be asked, why should such divergence in view-points exist, when both Western and Indian Psychologies claim to deal with the human mind and human personality which are the same from whatever view-point they are approached? But, are there not wide and even irreconcilable differences between the different contemporary Schools of Western Psychology which claim to deal with the same

human mind? Each one of these Schools concentrates just on one aspect of human personality to the exclusion of others—on the body, on the conscious and the sub-conscious mind or on the unconscious mind. The result is that each has developed a set of unique conceptual tools very effective in its own realm, but utterly ineffective in the realm of the others. Similarly, Indian Psychology, which takes into its fold the experiences at the *Superconscious* level unknown and unintelligible to Western Psychology, has evolved a terminology which is alien to Western Psychology. Hindu Psychology deals with the totality of man's nature and experience, while Western Psychology—even putting together all the conflicting Psychological Schools of our day—deals only with a part of human personality, ignoring *the Superconscious*. It will be a herculean task to express the Hindu Psychological concepts in the language of Western Psychology.

Added to this difficulty is another which is not so formidable, but is at the same time sufficiently baffling. The Rasa doctrine belongs to the realm of aesthetics brought into existence through the creative faculty of the artist, the poet, the dramatist and others of the fraternity. Psychology, particularly psychology of the affective state is concerned with the realm of experience outside the theatre and the world of imagination of the literary artist. Great care is needed in carrying over into aesthetics the psychological principles formulated by the West. Of course, we have now Psychology of Art as a branch of Applied Psychology. Even so Psychological Aesthetics is a most treacherous ground to tread on. Dr. Rakesa Gupta has, therefore, all our sympathy and admiration.

The term 'Rasa' baffles all our attempts at translation. Neither emotion, nor sentiment, nor poetic relish, nor any one of the terms suggested, brings out its true significance, for these terms belong to a different universe of discourse. A learned friend suggested "*Aesthesis*" as an equivalent. I

believe that is the best rendering in English we have had so far.

Dr. Rakesa Gupta has sought the aid of Ribot, Drever, William James, Stout, Woodworth and McDougall in expounding the Rasa theory. I believe his intention is to acquaint those of the West as well as those of the East who are not familiar with Sanskrit, with the essentials of 'Rasa' doctrine. I wish he had confined himself to McDougall's Hormic Psychology which may be called Depth Psychology and which alone provides the ground for dealing with aesthetic experience. The terms emotion, sentiment, feeling and conation have distinct and clear-cut meanings in Hormic Psychology, and so have the expressions Primary Emotion, Blended Emotion and Derived Emotion. Unfortunately, Dr. Rakesa Gupta has missed this very important contribution of McDougall. The difficulties and confusions that he complains of in chapter I of the Second Section of his book, as well as those in which he has entangled himself, would not have arisen had he made a strict and scientific use of terms according to McDougallian Psychology. I may mention an example by way of illustration. On pages 125 and 126, the author attempts to establish the difference between Emotion and Sentiment. According to McDougall the difference is plain and simple. An Emotion is a mental element, a sentiment is a mental compound, to use chemical phraseology. When two or more emotions are blended and organised round an object, a person or an idea then a Sentiment comes into existence. A sentiment is thus generated by the blending of two or more *primary emotions* and is truly a blended emotion. A Derived Emotion is not an emotion at all according to McDougall. It is a variety of feeling which may arise in the course of the operation of any strong impulse, and along with any Primary or Blended Emotion. And then again, it should be remembered that each emotion has a three-

fold aspect—the excitant, the psychic state with its neural and glandular expressions, and the final expression in bodily activity in relation to the environment. A Sentiment, which is only a blended emotion, has also three aspects but in a more complex and complicated manner. These psychological facts should be kept steadily in view when we deal with Psychological Aesthetics.

There is a very important contribution of McDougallian psychology, fundamental to the understanding of aesthetic experience which Dr. Gupta seems to have ignored, and that is the theory of Sympathetic Induction of Emotions and Sentiments. This theory clears up many of the abstruse points in the 'Rasa Doctrine'. The reviewer can only refer the readers to the exposition of this important theory in McDougall's basic works and in the reviewer's monograph on Hormic Theory. Many of the confusions inherent in the concepts of Bhāva—Sthāyī, Sañcārī and Vigabhicārī—will be cleared up, and all the difficulties removed if a proper application of "Sympathetic Induction" is made to the elucidation of aesthetic experience. The psychology of the creator of art and the enjoyer of art will stand out clear-cut and well-defined in the light of this theory.

And above all there is the new Psychology of the *Unconscious* which is ignored not only by Dr. Gupta but by practically all writers on aeshetics. This is a new and difficult field but, it must be remembered that the roots of aesthesis are in the unconscious. The psychological forces that lead to the production of art objects, literary and plastic, as well as the forces that govern the appreciation of these objects have their ultimate origin in the unconscious strata of the human mind. Nor can the superconscious be forgotten. Hence any aesthetic writer who claims to expound the 'Rasa Doctrine' should familiarise himself with Depth Psychology including its Psycho - analytic branches, Psychology of Aesthetics based on Depth Psychology and the

Hindu Pyschology of the Superconscious as expounded by Swāmī Akhilānanda. The reviewer hopes that Dr. Rakesa Gupta will make a deep and penetrating study of the above and present to us, in a second edition of his book, the 'Rasa Doctrine' in its proper perspective.

—P. S. Naidu

PARAMĀNANDA KĀVYA OF KAVĪNDRA PARAMĀNANDA. EDITED—By Govind Sakharam Sardesai. Gaekwad's Oriental Series No. CXX. pp. 31, 183, 3. Oriental Institute, Baroda. 1952. Price Rs. 10.

The volume contains the poem of Kavīndra Paramānanda on the last days of Shivaji and the life of his son Sambhaji and has been edited for the first time. At Shivaji's grand coronation in June 1674, the poet was commissioned to write an epic on the national hero which he planned in 100 cantos. Out of these only 31 cantos were written when Shivaji died. The poet attended the coronation of Sambhaji at Raigarh in July 1680 and to secure the Raja's favour Paramānanda resumed his epic from the period at 3 years before Shivaji's death when Sambhaji had a rupture with his father and began to act independently. Thirteen cantos were written and they cover 2 years stopping exactly one year before Shivaji's death; and these 13 cantos form Section III of the present work. Paramānanda died in 1687. After half a century, Govinda II, the grandson of Paramānanda, came to the court of Chatrapati Sahu and a fragment of 5 cantos from section V of the present work, dealing with Sambhaji's adoration of Kālī and her prophecy that he would have a world-conquering son Sahu.

Most of the facts mentioned in the poem are themes of correct history but what gives a special charm to this

poem is the graphic picture which it supplies about the social and religious conditions prevailing in Mahārāṣṭra of those days, such as are probably unequalled by any other source.

Sir Jadunath Sarkar adds a valuable foreword where he gives the history of the Tantric cult in Mahārāṣṭra. He warns the reader expressly that he who wants to understand the true teaching of the Tantras should study the essays and translations from old Sanskrit works written by Arthur Avalon (the nom de plume of Sir John Woodroffe, a Judge of the Calcutta High Court). The new window opened in this poem enables the reader to get an inside view of the religious developments in Maharaṣṭra and the workings of the royal court under Sambhaji which are unknown to us from any other source. Tantricism was an import from Bengal into Maharaṣṭra in Shivaji's time. The first success of this new cult headed by Sıva-yogī was when he induced Shivaji to hold a second coronation of himself under Tantric rules. Next came their crowning victory, the capture of the Government by Sambhaji. The heart of Sambhaji was sad because no heir tó his throne had been born yet. The Vedic Brahmaṇas had failed to remove his sterility by their *Pūjās*. Therefore, Sambhaji turned to the Tantric priests. Shiva-yogī was brought to the court as the greatest miracle working saint of the country. He advised the king to worship Kālī. The worship of the demons of the nether world was more efficacious than that of the bright deities of the sky and an heir to the king was born in May 1682. This confirmed the triumph of Tantric cult and the monopoly of power in the government of Sambhaji.

This dark chapter in India's religious history now illuminated by this poem has a moral lesson to give to modern India.

SELECTIONS FROM ORME MANUSCRIPTS. EDITED—By Dewan Bahadur C. S. Srinivasachariar M. A. Published by the Annamalai University, Annamalainagar, 1952. Pages xxv & 394 Price Rs. 15.

The Government of India adopted the policy in 1939 of making their records in the Imperial Record Department now known as the National Archives of India, available to bona fide research students. A few volumes were reserved for editing by the Government Department but (a) the records in Oriental Languages in 8 volumes and (b) selections from English records in 5 volumes were both to be published by Universities and learned societies at their own expense. The Ganganatha Jha Research Institute has published "The Sanskrit Documents" under the first head and now the Annamalai University has published the book under review under the second head.

Mr. C. S. Srinivasacharya, University Professor of History and Politics was appointed to edit this volume and he died in 1951 after making the work ready for the press with his notes; and the work has now been published with an introduction by R. Satyanatha Iyer, the present Professor of History & Politics, Annamalai University.

Robert Orme's *Indostan* is a classic comparable to Wilks' *Mysoor* and Duff's *Mahrattas*. Robert Orme arrived in Calcutta in 1742 as a servant of the East India Company. In 1754 as a member of the council of Fort St. George, he participated in the deliberations regarding the military operations in the Carnatic. Due to the invincible arguments of Orme based on his knowledge of the politics of Bengal, Clive was chosen to lead the expedition against Sirajud-daulah resulting in the British Empire being founded. Orme intrigued for the Governorship of Madras but was finally compelled to return to England in 1760 and he devoted the rest of his life to historical and other academic

pursuits. In 1769 he was appointed as Historiographer to the company and he continued to hold his position till his death. Orme enriched his library to complete the collection of materials for his history. In 1763 he wrote a "*History of the Military transactions of the British Nation in Indostan.*" Vol. I which was hailed as a monument of accuracy and impartiality. Other works followed. His books and manuscripts were presented to the East India Company —51 volumes of print and 231 volumes of manuscript. The selections in this volume under review are from these manuscripts left by him and enable us to peep into the workshop of the Anglo-Indian historian of the Anglo-French struggle in India.

The first 2 extracts are from the writings of Captain Dolson whose conspicuous activities in the defence of Trichinopoly 1752-1753 are well known. The 3rd extract relates to the French capture of Madras in 1746 by Hallyburton. Sections 4 to 10 are largely from the pen of Dr. James Wilson who was surgeon to the troops in the expedition to Arcot in 1751. The 11th extract relates to Major Lawrence and the 12*th* writes the treachery of his Dubash Ponniah. The 13*th* extract describes the negotiation carried on at London for an adjustment of the differences between the English and the French on the Coromandel coast. The last 2 extracts relate to 1758 : Wynch's Journal of the siege of Fort St. David.

The Extracts cover 265 pages and the modern reader would be able to follow the raw materials of history with the illuminating footnotes covering 129 pages from the pen of the Editor Srinwasachariar an authoirty on the British and French conquests of South India. R. Satyanatha Iyer's Introduction giving a general historical account of this period enables the reader to follow the documents still further with ease.

This work under review is one of the main source

books for South Indian History in the 18*th* Century. The scholarly world is indebted to the Editors for this and it is very useful for the students of History of that period.

धर्मसंग्रह :—A collection of moral sayings collected from the Itihāsas and the Purāṇas—Edited by P. V. Ramanujaswami M. A., Director Sri Venkateśvara Oriental Institute, Tirupati. 1941. Pages x and 84. Sri Venkateśvara Oriental Series No. 27 Price Rs. two.

The Tirupati Sri Venkateśvara Oriental Institute should be congratulated for having compiled a Manual of Religious or Moral instruction free from sectarianism for use in Schools and Colleges. The work contains 583 extracts from the *Mahābhārata*, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Bhāgavata* arranged under 168 heads. The book is mainly intended for the use of teachers and students. We extend a welcome to this publication and suggest that an edition of the book with Hindi meaning for the use of public will be very useful in order to inspire students to higher and nobler ideas of Conduct and Character.

THE FUNDAMENTAL ASPIRATIONS OF MAN ACCORDING TO INDIAN THAUGHT. Dewan Bahadur K. Krishnaswami Rao Lectures, Madras University 1952, by K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B. A., B. L., M. L. C. Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Mylapore, Madras 1952 pp. i and 37. Price Re. 1.

In Sanskrit literature the subject is discussed under the caption 'Puruṣārthas'. References to the 4 Puruṣārthas are contained in the Indian classics ranging from the Vedas, through the Dharmaśāstras down to the Kāvya literature.

Though the subject is a fit one for an exhaustive treatise, the author who is an Advocate, a scholar of deep learning and the Secretary of the Kuppuswamy Sastri Institute has managed to assemble a large array—99 Sanskrit Texts—of authorities bearing on the subject of Puruṣārthas in Sanskrit literature and Dharmasāstra through the ages.

The work also shows that the basic foundations of Tamil culture are identical with those of laid down in the Dharmaśāstras.

Students of Indian Philosophy will find the booklet quite interesting and informative.

NITIPRAKĀSIKĀ of Vaiśampāyana with the commentary "तत्त्वविवृति" of Sitarama. Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts series No. 24. Edited by T. Chandrasekharan M. A., L. T., Curator, Government Oriental Muniscript Library Madras. 1953. Pages vi, 112 and xii. Price Rs. 4–2–0.

This is a work dealing with धनुर्वेद—the weapons of war in Ancient India and is printed for the first time. The date of the author and the commentator is unknown. The first 5 Adhyāyas deal with the classification and definition of the various weapons and arms. The other 3 Adhyāyas deal with military strategy, recruitment of soldiers to the army, appointment of officers and their emoluments and the duties of kings. More than 136 weapons are mentioned and described. They are all classified under 4 groups or varieties *viz.* मुक्त, अमुक्त, मुक्तामुक्त and मन्त्रमुक्त. The work comes in the category of works like the *Artha-śāstra*, but deals mainly with the variety of weapons besides military and state administration. The Curator at Madras should be congratulated for making this work available to those who are interested in military service of ancient India.

Now, that the Military Service has become a subject of study in the Universities, there is ample justification for a study of war-fare in Ancient India being also prescribed, especially the weapons of war, methods and technique and inter-statal law.

SANSKRIT COMIC CHARACTERS. By J. T. Parikh M. A. Professor of Sanskrit, M. T. B. College, Surat. 1952. The Popular Book Store, Surat. Pages ii and 72. Price Rs. Two.

This is a study in English of the Vidūṣakas in the Sanskrit drama. The other comic and humorous characters have been left out for a later consideration. The book would be of greater service to the students when the other part is also published. The author has explained the wealth and variety of humour offered in what is usually considered as the common type of a Vidūṣaka. A few extracts are given in translation. University students want more and that with the Sanskrit text as well. A study like the work before us is mainly the result of following the works of literary criticism in English the 'English Comic Characters' of J. B. Priestly being the model followed by the author. It is a matter of great satisfaction that Professor Parikh has been writing such subjects in a critical manner. The book is quite useful to our students.